

BV
4012
A8
1978-
1979

THE ELEVENTH AND TWELFTH ACPE CONFERENCES

1978 HUMAN ECOLOGY: HOPE AND RESPONSIBILITY
ELEVENTH ANNUAL ACPE CONFERENCE
NOVEMBER 9-11, 1978 -- SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

1979 TO SERVE THE PRESENT AGE: PERSONAL AND POLITICAL POWER
TWELFTH ANNUAL ACPE CONFERENCE
OCTOBER 18-21, 1979 -- WASHINGTON, D.C.

THE ASSOCIATION FOR CLINICAL PASTORAL EDUCATION, INC.
Interchurch Center, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD..... Charles E. Hall, Jr.	iii
WHAT, IN THE LIGHT OF THE CRISIS OF OUR TIMES, CAN WE REASONABLY HOPE FOR?..... John Cobb	1
WHAT, THEN, IS OUR RESPONSIBILITY TOWARDS OUR CHILDREN'S CHILDREN?.... John Cobb	6
THE FUTURE OF THE FUTURE: IN WHAT CAN WE HOPE?..... Jane A. Boyajian Raible	13
THE FUTURE'S FUTURE: OUR RESPONSIBILITY..... Jane A. Boyajian Raible	22
WOMEN IN CPE..... Chris Bennett	33
CERTIFICATION VERSUS FREEDOM FOR MINISTRY..... Richard John Neuhaus	41
ACPE PILGRIMAGE -- PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL..... John R. Thomas	65

FOREWORD

Charles E. Hall, Jr.
Executive Director, ACPE

This volume contains the major addresses given at the eleventh and twelfth annual conferences of the Association for Clinical Pastoral Education. The manuscripts were prepared from tape recordings.

The 1978 conference held in Seattle, Washington, on the theme "Hope and Responsibility" featured John Cobb of Claremont School of Theology, Jane Boyajian Raible of the Northwest Life Sciences Institute and Chris Bennett of Jesuit School of Theology. The presentations challenged CPE Supervisors to consider the total environment and the systems that are destructive to the environment as well as the hope that is inherent in the awareness of the need for change.

The 1979 conference in Washington, D. C., on the theme "To Serve the Present Age: Personal and Political Power" featured Richard John Neuhaus, Lutheran pastor, and respondents William Arnold, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia, Robert Myers, III, Virginia Institute of Pastoral Care, Cameron Byrd, Church of the Redeemer, Washington, D. C., and Peggy Way, Vanderbilt Divinity School, Nashville, Tennessee. In the interchange of ideas, the CPE Supervisor is challenged to take seriously the theological ground of pastoral care and clinical pastoral education.

John R. Thomas, ACPE President 1980-81, gave his inaugural presidential address at the 1979 conference entitled, "ACPE Pilgrimage - Personal and Professional."

The ACPE Conference Proceedings provide a rich content of material for study and discussion, and mark in history the concerns which are central for CPE at a given time.

"WHAT, IN THE LIGHT OF THE CRISIS OF OUR TIMES, CAN WE REASONABLY HOPE FOR?"

Address by Dr. John Cobb, Claremont School of Theology
Presented Thursday, November 9, 1978 - Eleventh Annual Conference
Association for Clinical Pastoral Education - Seattle, Washington

You can imagine it's a little difficult for a professor who is geared up for 50 minute periods to be asked to talk for 20 to 30 minutes. But I'm trying to think--ok, I've got one 50 minute period and I'm splitting it in two days. So I'll give you the first half today and the second half tomorrow, I guess.

It seems to me that though we all recognize that there is some kind of a crisis to which we want to address ourselves, and I'm glad that we put that in our presupposition, I can't talk very seriously with you about how I try to deal with that crisis, how I would urge other people to respond, without saying in some very simple way--or at least very brief way--what the crisis is, how I'm defining the crisis in terms of which my thoughts are shaped. So let me just run through that very quickly and then try to give some quick response, and we'll develop some of the elements in that tomorrow in a different way.

Now the first image of the crisis that I would suggest to you is that many of us have come to decide that we can't stand any more progress, that is, that what we have known as progress for a long period of time turns out, if projected in the future, to be suicidal. I will not explain or develop that but just say that's part of my presupposition in this whole area. Then, secondly, I've come to very deep and personal realization of how profoundly we are all shaped and conditioned by an understanding of life and the meaning of life and of what's valuable in life that demands progress. I think this is true both personally and institutionally. That is, the way in which the institution in which I participate, the School of Theology at Claremont, is geared and the way it was shaped and the way our morale was developed. All was on the assumption of progress over the years...and a lot of the pain we feel now is that we haven't been progressing for some years. And so we sort of live by hope that we can once again begin to progress in terms of having more money and some of those things which progress means to us. I suspect that the whole profession in which most of you are involved depends upon, for its very survival, at least the continuation of the degree of affluence that we have come to know in this country, and probably on some progress in that sense. So we're caught in a very deep bind, institutionally. And then if we ask ourselves personally about our own private expectations for the future, the kinds of expectations our families have, and so forth, they are all bound up with just that progress which, it turns out, if it continues, is going to be suicidal. For our whole civilization.

Now the results of this recognition are tending at the present time to be the heightening of separatism, fragmentation, mutual recrimination and bitterness. I think we all have a sense that the national ethos, if we just limit it to the United States for the moment, is decaying, and most of the energies of people go into more restricted interests. We're becoming more a nation of competing interest groups who put their energies into trying to

make sure that at least that group, my group in my case--that my group gets its share of the pie. If the pie's not growing any longer it becomes all the more important that at least we don't lose our share of it and, hopefully, the cut will come in somebody else's budget and not in the part that comes to me. Now all of this has made me realize that we are individually part of the problem. That is, I am not the one who can stand outside the problem and talk critically about how other people are behaving, how other institutions are acting, because it's my own values, my own commitments, my own hopes, my own fears that characterize the lives of many other people as well, that jointly produce this extremely painful tension between what I foresee and what I continue to hope for at a very deep level.

When I face all that I say, well, what about changing. Obviously some kind of change is needed. And to me a major part of the crisis is my own unwillingness to change. And as I observe other people I seem to see the same kind of thing in other people. We're not really willing to change. We're willing to talk about change, but that's quite a different matter. My wife and I participated for four years in communal living. That is a kind of a change. But just observing how we behaved in the context of communal living clearly reinforced my conviction that we are not willing to change in any adequate or significant way; such that I could take any pride in having been willing to do some experimenting in the area of change. So the furthest I've gone toward changing has reinforced my awareness of my own unwillingness to change.

I think I know some people who really are willing to change. I'm not one of them, but I think I know some. But even in their case I find there is a sense in which they are trapped. Even when you are willing to change you can't change. One of the kinds of changes that seems to me most obviously important is that we give up the automobile civilization. That would mean just giving up the automobile, if I wish to be a part of that change. But those of us living in Southern California probably to a slightly lesser extent, those of you living in many other parts of the country find that to cease to make use of the private automobile is almost impossible. It's not just a matter of unwillingness. There are objective bases on which one can say to do that just doesn't work, you would have to drop out from society in a kind of fundamental way which isn't, from my point of view, the right kind of change. So even those who would be personally willing to make unlimited sacrifices, and they are very rare---I'm not going to ask for a show of hands---find themselves trapped in a whole social structure, which includes the whole way in which our cities are built, the whole way in which our agriculture is organized, the whole system of institutions which is so bound up with extravagant use of resources that there seems to be no way of changing it.

To me, that's a crisis. A crisis that's inwardly painful as well as being outwardly very dangerous. Perhaps the greatest danger is simply that one despairs and gives up, and that's a mood I frequently participate in. Even the little gestures which I make from time to time in order to try to live a life a little bit more appropriate to what I see is needed---they seem so petty, they seem so unimportant. Since now all of my children are through college and we have enough money to do pretty much what we want, why don't

"What, In the Light of the Crisis of our Times, Can We Reasonably Hope For?"
By Dr. John Cobb - Nov. 9, 1978

we just forget about all that stuff and enjoy ourselves the rest of our lives? That's a very natural attitude for me to fall back into, and I think again I observe it in other people as well. So I will express my sins as a kind of corporate expression and not merely as my own private ones.

Now, how can we live in such a time with some integrity. I'm trying to say I don't expect to be able to live with integrity, but I don't want to give up the ideal of integrity altogether. Somehow living with the awareness that I cannot and will not live with integrity and yet holding on to that ideal--that creates a special kind of tension in my own life that I think is probably where I have to find my life. Now the first answer that I have to that question is that I cannot survive without some sense of humor about myself. If I can't admit my own ridiculousness, I then can't stand myself. And I think we can learn to poke fun at other people, too, as long as it's clear that we're poking fun at ourselves in the midst of it all and recognize that incongruity is a part of healthy life in all times and places. Christian life has never been understood as one that was congruous with the actuality of the world. Always incongruous. The danger, of course, is that we regard it, regard that particular form of incongruity with some kind of self-righteousness, that's probably worse than despair, though those are in tough competition with each other.

I don't think that there's nothing else that we can do. I do think that most of us are not able to make radical shifts in our basic way of relating to ourselves and other people. A few can, but I've just confessed that I have not been able to participate in that myself even when I thought I was trying. But we can change our perceptions. I think some of us have changed our perceptions. Though it may be a long way from changing perception to changing life, that is a starting point, an indispensable starting point. I think we can begin to develop what I call global consciousness, and that is an awareness of what would be, in light of the total global situation, an appropriate way of living. Now again, in doing that we will heighten our sense of the incongruity between the way we are actually living and the way that would be appropriate to live, and that's painful. But I believe that most of us can live with a certain amount of that pain and that that's a necessary step toward any kind of real change. We used to call it repentance, I don't know whether you like that word anymore. But we are not likely to repent unless we live with the sense of that incongruity pretty deeply for a long time.

I think another thing that has become more possible just because of our relative affluence and our recognition that affluence doesn't solve our problems is that more and more of us are probably able to withdraw from the--how shall I put it--the dominant values of our society, namely, possession and money. If you ask what makes our world go 'round, let's talk about our American world--it is very largely money. It is our love of money. The Bible says something about the love of money and the root of evil, and it's a highly relevant comment in relationship to our present situation. I think any of us can realize that most of our decisions, or many of our decisions, we still make in terms of whether we can afford something, or whether something is an advance. And advance, professional advance, usually reads with dollar signs. But we can withdraw from that more, probably, than we could ten or fifteen years ago. The sixties taught those of our generation something in that area,

"What, In the Light of the Crisis of our Times, Can We Reasonably Hope For?"
By Dr. John Cobb - Nov. 9, 1978

and I'm hoping that we can keep that alive, not that it may have a profound direct effect on our behavior, but at least that our whole self-understanding won't be based on possession and consumption, to the extent that has been characteristic in the past. That, to me, is an extremely important step which must precede or at least go along with any kind of significant behavioral changes. Of course, we must hope that this begins to express itself in behavioral changes and in political changes.

I will not say anything now about spelling those out. That's an area of experimentation at the present time. I do think it sad that our leadership, first, has not been able to galvanize such sentiments as there are in this country of readiness to change and that, secondly, when it has tried to make moderate suggestions, slight steps in the direction of the change that we need, the majority of people rise up against them. We all want change but not where it pinches us. It's very difficult to find a significant kind of change that doesn't pinch somebody. And that somebody is always too powerful a group to get by. The history of the effort of energy legislation in this country is, to me, a very painful one in this respect. I won't go into details on that.

Now, what else can we say, how can we keep going in this kind of a crisis that has such a painful existential cut, the more painful the more sensitive we are, and I hope I'm speaking to a group of very sensitive people and, therefore, a group who find the whole situation extremely painful, as I do. I can only live with it, that is, live with it in the sense of letting the consciousness of it keep alive, for me, by continually struggling with some visions of hope, and I'm going to try to give some concreteness to them tomorrow. That is, unless I can have some sense of what a world would look like that could exist, I don't think I'll be able to keep trying. Then I would just say, well, this situation is objectively hopeless and I may as well enjoy the fact that I'm sitting at the tail-end of the affluent era, and just enjoy the pre-requisites that come with that, and let it go. But I do think that the world has the resources and the intelligence, in principle, to construct itself at the present time in a way that will be sustainable for a very long period of time at a level of enjoyment for a vast number of people that would be in excess of anything we've had in the past---if we were willing to make, or were able to make, or could be brought to make the necessary changes. And that's important for me.

I speculate about scenarios that might lead from somewhere near where we now are toward a future that I could believe in. I have to have some sense that it's possible to live now in a certain sense in the light of that possibility in the future. The New Testament understanding of the relationship of life now in this present eon, to the Kingdom that is to come, has become far more meaningful to me in the last five years than it ever was before. I don't think that the language of the Kingdom of Heaven is directly the one that speaks to many of us today, but if I speak of a just and sustainable society, that's a very meaningful idea to me. What would a just and sustainable society be like. And then I can ask the question, not how can I make or help to make that society come into being, but rather what would it mean now to live in a way that is appropriate to that society. This is to live in the anticipation

"What, In the Light of the Crisis of our Times, Can We Reasonably Hope For?"
By Dr. John Cobb - Nov. 9, 1978

of what can and should be, rather than to be always worrying about the practical consequences that are going to follow if I do A, B or C. I must say that when I try to project those practical kinds of consequences I always end up so close to zero that it's extremely disheartening. But I feel I can have some measure of integrity in my life if I live now from a world that might be and try to embody it somehow, in some very small measure, in my own lifestyle.

Finally, very closely related to that, but at least putting the matter in a different way, for me personally, my sense of the value and possibility of the future is bound up extremely close, I would say even is identical, with my faith in God. And I want to say that very clearly, because it's absolutely central and essential for me. If I did not believe in God I would not have any hope, at least I cannot imagine how I could. Since I cannot quite put myself in that situation I perhaps shouldn't speak so definitely. For me, belief that surprising things can happen, that truly new things can break into history, that the future does not have to be simply the determinate outcome of the past, that's all bound up directly and immediately with belief in God. I believe it is precisely God that is that by virtue of which the new enters into history. I mean the unforeseen and unpredictable new. Now my point here is that I cannot honestly project a future out of what I know about us, that is a hopeful future. That's what I was trying to explain as I portrayed what I take to be the crisis of our time. Maybe some of you are able to detect a kind of virtue in human beings that I cannot detect, a virtue in yourselves that I cannot detect in myself. But I do believe that I do detect in history, in personal experience, the continual breaking in of that which does not arise out of my own resources or out of the conscious and intentional planning of anybody, and it seems to me we are now already, in all of its horror, nevertheless at a position that would have been completely unpredictable ten years ago. If you think back to the degree of awareness of this range of problems that existed ten years ago and then think about our present situation, a change has taken place of totally unforeseeable magnitude. To me, that's a ground of hope. Not a ground of confidence, not a ground of assurance, not a ground of certitude, but a ground of hope. And it is out of that kind of hope that I live.

"WHAT, THEN, IS OUR RESPONSIBILITY TOWARDS OUR CHILDREN'S CHILDREN?"

Address by Dr. John Cobb, Claremont School of Theology
Presented Friday, November 10, 1978 - Eleventh Annual Conference
Association for Clinical Pastoral Education - Seattle, Washington

In Hawaii when you come to the podium, very often, if you are a man at least, a young woman comes up and puts a garland of flowers around your shoulders and kisses you. I think I prefer the Hawaiian system, but....

I was talking yesterday about the environmental issues. I suppose I moved from ecology to environment, and from environment to survival, because I think that the most foundational issue in regard to environment is whether the environment will be able to continue to support human life on this planet, or at least anything like the amount of human life that now exists on the planet. This can lead very directly to political questions, but I differ perhaps a little bit from Jane in thinking that the, at least most direct, responsibility of the church may not be politics but may be changing the quality of understanding out of which political action comes. Obviously these two are very close together, but I'm afraid of political activism until the consciousness out of which the decisions about political matters arise is broadened.

This is true with respect to the kind of political activism that is sometimes generated by our consciousness, for example, of the world hunger problem. And I'll come back to that to indicate how deeply tragic, I think, most of our most conscientious efforts are when we are not illumined by a sufficiently inclusive understanding of the total environmental or ecological question. Having said that, I'd like to spend just a couple of minutes talking about the sorts of changes in the way in which we perceive our world, and the way in which we understand ourselves, that seem to me to be extremely urgent in our culture at the present time. And I'm glad to say the kinds of changes of which I'm speaking are ones which one can detect already taking place, though if we ask what are the dominant attitudes still institutionalized in society, they are very different from these.

First, we have inherited---and we're hearing this over and over again today---we have inherited fundamental dualistic attitudes which block us from dealing appropriately with the world in which we live. Now I think most of us know that by now, so that's not new information. There is, however, a long distance to go from realizing that dualism is a misleading way of understanding ourselves and our world, and the actual appropriation of that in the transformation of our experience, in relationship to the world. Among the dualisms are, of course, the dualism of psyche and soma, the dualism of the human and the natural, or the human and the animal, and the dualism between the divine and the natural. If we had time I think we could illustrate quite concretely and specifically how these are misdirecting energies, conscientious energies, at the present time. We are devoting ourselves to doing things which will be counter-productive in terms of ourselves right now. But I don't have time to develop any of those.

"What, Then, Is Our Responsibility Towards Our Children's Children?"
By Dr. John Cobb - Nov. 10, 1978

I want to move on, then, to another closely related but somewhat distinct topic and that is the topic of specialization and fragmentation. That is, our whole scientific mind-set has been one of regarding the way of making advances in the area of thinking, in the area of understanding, as defining a particular range of issues and problems, developing a methodology appropriate to that range of issues and problems, defining thereby a science and then developing specialists within that science. It has been immensely successful. I sometimes polemicize with great passion against success as a criterion of the worthiness of an enterprise. The very fact that you succeed is probably an indication you're making a mistake. Certainly we have been immensely successful. We have learned a vast amount. But we have substituted science for wisdom. And the more knowledge we gain the less wisdom we have had to direct the affairs of our culture and our society.

Our universities are now embodiments of this specialized and fragmentary mode of approaching reality, our professions express the same things; our government bureaucracy expresses the same thing, and so forth and so on. There is a profound institutionalization of fragmented knowledge. Now the whole point of the ecological understanding is that this is totally wrong, totally misleading, totally distorting and extremely destructive. And we cannot deal responsibly in relationship to our children's children unless we can transform these institutions which embody this fragmentation. It doesn't do any good just to know that it's bad, as long as we are educating people consistently. The best educational system we have is one which divides us from each other and divides us, separates us, from an actual grasp of the reality with which we are dealing.

I want to illustrate this in relationship to development policies. I believe that development policies thus far---and I mean the best ones, I mean the most conscientious, the most generous ones. I'm not talking about anybody being cynical or doing sinister things. I'm talking about the best things that we've been doing in the last quarter century---have been destructive of those whom we've been trying to help in the great majority of instances; and the reason very clearly is because they have been guided by specialists. The economist is one, not by any means the only one, of the specialists who has been doing this great damage, in terms of global development in recent times. Economists are rarely trained in ecology. That's, I think, an understatement. That's not the way you get a Ph.D. in economics. And that's not to scold them any more than any of the rest of us. Theologians are rarely trained in economics. That makes us unwise also. Economists are not worse than we are. I'm just saying that it's a disease we all share together.

The system whereby economists approach development is, if I may caricature it but state it very simply, that our task in relationship to impoverished nations is to increase gross national product in those nations. If there is a sufficiently large gross national product, there can be a large amount of consumption, you can divide that total by the number of people and you will discover that the standard of living has gone up. Now, recent studies indicated that twenty years of this properly-called trickle-down theory have succeeded even by the economists' own views of success, in only four out of about 100 countries studied. I think a great many people without much knowledge but with a little

"What, Then, Is Our Responsibility Towards Our Children's Children?"

By Dr. John Cobb - Nov. 10, 1978

wisdom were very much aware of the fact that the system was failing for a long time before economic measurements would show that it was failing. Very little trickles down. And, in fact, the net result of these development systems has been to put the emphasis on, first, urban and industrial development because that's the place you can get the fastest increase in the gross national product. Perfectly logical. It follows completely from economic theory. The agricultural base is used only for earning funds by which industrial development can take place. It's been part of the system. The net result of this, of course, has been to make the problem of world hunger worse, to destroy village life, to increase the sizes of the slums around great centers; it has led to the appearance in many African countries and other places as well of elites who live, according to European and American and Japanese standards, in the midst of a large number of people who are more impoverished, degraded than ever before. They have lost the dignity that they could have in their small rural communities which have been wiped out for the purpose of turning the agricultural sector into a money-making sector for the sake of the cities.

That's a very harsh and sweeping generalization about the effect of development policies as implemented by the United States, the United Nations and other development agencies but, I think, insofar as one can summarize it in a few sentences, it's basically an accurate statement. Now that was correct action from the point of view of economic theory. It works well on paper if you only take one very limited set of questions at a time. But it was not wise. And there was nobody around who had wisdom enough to call attention to the fact that it wasn't wise. Not nobody, but nobody who could carry any clout. Because if you want to ask whether any economist's policy is a good policy, you ask another economist. That's the system in our world. Even if you got an interdisciplinary group, until very recently, no ecologist would have been included. Even today, it's not at all certain that one would and the ecologist, after all, is likely to operate as a specialist in a particular branch of biology with no more general wisdom about these matters, probably very insensitive to the quality of village life in the African bush---just as insensitive as the economist would be.

There are other types of development that are possible and which have had a small amount of attention given them. We might say that, perhaps---I say this very hesitantly---some church groups had a little more wisdom than the national and international community in general. But on the whole, the church has bought into the system of experts. We are just as likely to call the expert to tell us how to do it---rather than trust any insight that our own faith might give us about the wholeness of human life, the wholeness of community life---as any other groups. I don't think we can say very much about the superior wisdom of the church.

There's another line of experts who are doing tremendous things. We call them agronomists, agricultural specialists. If you know anything about what has happened to the agricultural specialists you know that they are very, very closely bound in with agri-business in this country. Agricultural colleges are no longer oriented to family farming, they are oriented to how to be profitable in agri-business. That's a sweeping generalization but I challenge you to test it out in your state, wherever that state may be, and I give you pretty high odds that you'll find I'm basically correct in that generalization.

"What, Then, Is Our Responsibility Towards Our Children's Children?"
By Dr. John Cobb - Nov. 10, 1978

OK, so as we became aware, some people back in the early sixties, that there was going to be a problem about producing enough food, and especially in the tropical area. It's always the poorest parts of the world that are suffering the most and where the problem gets most acute, and that is the tropical world. We said, well, we've learned how to produce a great deal of food, with relatively few people, in the northern hemisphere. So we need to see how to adapt those methods to the tropical world. Well, we've effected the green revolution. And it is immensely successful in doing exactly what it set out to do. Marvelously successful. The question of whether it's wise, that's a very different issue, but that question was never raised. Because we don't have a system of asking about wisdom, we have only a system of asking about technical success. It has been marvelously successful, it has driven millions of peasants off of the farm into the slums around the cities, it has increased the amount of food and decreased the capacity of the poor people to buy it.

There really is success there. I don't think any of these things are wholly evil. They are certainly motivated by the deepest concern for the hungry people of the world, but not motivated by wisdom, because we have no institutional form of wisdom and we don't know how to operate outside of our institutions. We do know how to increase agricultural productivity. Of course, what we have done is to substitute water-intensive, energy-intensive, capital-intensive modes of agriculture in the tropics for the labor-intensive forms that used to operate there. It's also the case that these new forms are ecologically extremely destructive. The speed of the deterioration of the environment in the tropics is speeded up by those things which we are doing in order to produce food faster.

We, in this country, also become aware of the fact that we need to produce more food--more food for a hungry world--so we also accelerate the trend away from concern for the soil in order to mine the soil more rapidly to produce food more rapidly. A great deal of what's happened in agriculture in this country, motivated by the noble purpose of feeding the world, is taking food away from our children's children. There is, there must be, a better way. There are better ways. But there is no system of getting at the better ways within fragmented and specialized, current styles. It's not enough even to have interdisciplinary approaches. That's better than having unidisciplinary approaches. Somehow we have to find a way in which we can get beyond a set of fragments, then pull some of those fragments together and think that if we've got six fragments then surely we have a whole. No number of fragments make a whole. You cannot get a wholistic vision out of any number of these fragments.

There are a few experiments taking place which seem to me very different from this, so I have hope. I do think there are possibilities. There are some people who have been working at development from the village level and, very recently, the World Bank has recognized that this is necessary. We do have some institutional awareness that a new style of development is needed at the present time. I'm very grateful for that, I don't want to minimize it at all. It is possible to work from the village level introducing a keener awareness of some ways in which the village life can be improved, in which

"What, Then, Is Our Responsibility Towards Our Children's Children?"

By Dr. John Cobb - Nov. 10, 1978

production can be improved, and in which there can be more export food from the village to the wider community about it. You can work to empower people at the village level, to take responsibility for their own lives and to improve them instead of simply wiping out the villages and sending people to urban slums. It can be done; it can be done with ecological and social and human sensitivity, and there are a few beautiful examples of how this can happen. It is possible to recognize that the style of agriculture which we've used with relative success in the northern hemisphere is not applicable to tropical countries, that it's rapidly destructive in tropical countries, and to do something very different.

I will mention simply one example. We have developed the raising of cattle as a relatively efficient and even ecologically or environmentally relatively satisfactory system for producing meat in the northern temperate zone. Also in the southern temperate zone. So we have assumed that what we need to do is to adapt cattle raising to the tropics. Now it turns out that in the tropics cattle raising in the great majority of instances---there are always exceptions, but on the whole---that cattle raising can be adapted but that it is ecologically destructive in rather rapid ways. There are enormous areas, for example in Kenya, which have in recent years been turned into desert by cattle raising. The most rapid way of making money out of cattle in much of Africa will destroy the land in ten years. It will turn areas that had been capable of supporting a large amount of wild life into desert that can support almost none. A great deal of the efforts of the agricultural experts has been directed toward extending the life of the African bush from ten years to fifty years under the use of cattle. Now that is considered enormous success, and there are methods, techniques now available, so that we can use the land for fifty years before it turns into desert. Now I think we need to recognize that is the goal of our scientific approach. You can make a lot of money in fifty years. And insofar as agriculture is understood as a way of making money, and making money for fifty years instead of ten, this is brilliantly successful. Success, yes, success! But if you're talking about your children's children, what kind of a world do you want to leave them?

It would be possible instead to produce meat with indigenous animals which do not harm the land, but such a program falls outside of every established specialization. Its only beneficiaries would be our unborn children. So, such programs lack support.

According to the United Nations, we have destroyed 50% of the arable land on the surface of the earth since we began agriculture. That is, in ten thousand years we have destroyed 50% of the base of our livelihood so far as our food is concerned. The speed at which we are destroying the basis of our livelihood in the future has, of course, vastly accelerated in the 19th and 20th centuries, and accelerated in the 1950's and 1960's, and is accelerating in the 1970's. We are talking about bringing under cultivation marginal land which, of course, deteriorates far more rapidly than the land that we have destroyed in the past. The very idea of sustainable agriculture has hardly entered into the reflection of the human species. That's shocking to me. You would think that we would know we had to develop a system of sustainable agri-

"What, Then, Is Our Responsibility Towards Our Children's Children?"
By Dr. John Cobb - Nov. 10, 1978

culture! One of the few that came close to it was the Nile Valley but now we have an Aswan Dam; so we have made sure that one is no longer sustainable over any very extended period of time. I think until we adopt a different attitude toward our children's children, and their children's children, we will not fundamentally change in our whole approach to development and we will continue to destroy the possibility of a decent life on this planet in the future.

Well, you can tell I think that I have more to say on that subject but I will have to pass on. The area of energy is another one, of course, in which we have had our consciousness raised. Again, unless we take a very long view and understand this problem very broadly, most of what we do because we have become aware that we are running out of oil is destructive rather than beneficial. This is, perhaps, more obvious than the kinds of things that I've been saying about agriculture. The greatest amount of effort which has been generated by the awareness that oil will be exhausted has gone, first, into the development of nuclear energy. Obviously, if we're not going to have enough oil then we have to do it by nuclear energy! Right? No other alternatives! Well, perhaps, coal. So we can stripmine the West, leave the West devastated, with all of its water supply destroyed. Well, maybe not coal, what else? Well, we can dream about solar energy.

The one thing that's really not politically possible to do in this country yet is to talk about efficient use of energy---and the reduced consumption of energy. We were not even happy in this room to have the lights darker, so I suppose we shouldn't be complaining too readily about the fact that industry is not interested in reduced consumption. But in this country we waste, in the most literal sense of wasting, about half our energy. That could be conserved. In other words, there could be enormous increase in the useful consumption of energy without any increase in the production of energy. But all of our projections into the future, all the reasons we have to build more power plants, all of the reasons that we have to stripmine the West are because conservation wouldn't work. We just can't expect people to make more efficient use of the energy that is now available! And the reason you can't expect that is because there's enormous investment, financial investment, in our present system. And you can't expect any of the industries that have such enormous effect upon our government to voluntarily suggest a system where they don't have the capital invested in such a way that they can profit from it. My own inclination is: let's sell the sun to General Motors. Then I believe we'll begin getting solar energy.

I will mention one other way in which we are continuing to destroy the possibility of making a healthy progress for the future and that's the way we build our cities. The way we build our cities is such as to require us to waste energy in enormous quantities. There are other ways of building cities, but they would require fundamentally different approaches. I'll just mention a man who has become a very close friend of mine. I hope some of you know him, Paolo Soleri, who is trying to build a very different kind of city in Arizona at the present time. Well, Soleri is doing various things in his dreaming of his future city. The one he is trying to build is a very small

"What, Then, Is Our Responsibility Towards Our Children's Children?"
By Dr. John Cobb - Nov. 10, 1978

prototype. One of the many gains that would come would be that the city could operate chiefly in terms of solar energy, the whole city. Very efficiently constructed so it would make the maximum use of solar energy and re-use energy many times and so forth and so on, it would also abolish the private automobile, and that would save an enormous amount of energy, etc.

I can't go into any of those details, I simply want to illustrate my basic point about our habits of mind. He goes to Washington from time to time. For a year he even maintained someone in Washington to see whether he couldn't get some Federal money to help him in developing this prototype. So he goes from agency to agency, and he talks to them about his overall vision, and no agency is set up in such a way it can pay any attention to an overall vision. So he can go to a particular agency that is interested in heating water with solar energy. Well he has to try to extract a tiny piece of his total vision that has to do with heating of water with solar energy. And if he could work up a request for funds that dealt only with that, and didn't touch any of the other features of the city, they'd be interested in that one. So if he could tear his city apart into a thousand fragments he might be able to get some funding for each one. But his whole conception is the other way. It's a wholistic vision, an overall solution, which deals not only with energy but also with human relationships with each other. It deals, indeed, with the future of the human race. Nobody in Washington can respond to that, not because Washington is an evil bureaucracy anymore than because any university in America is an evil university. It's because the mind-set which we have established doesn't allow for wholistic vision. The institutions don't allow for it. Now I believe the church still does, in some measure, stand for a wholistic approach to a whole human being in a whole community of the whole world. And I believe the theological resources still are present in the life of our community to provide a different stance in relationship to our current issues which could make for a livable world for our children's children.

"THE FUTURE OF THE FUTURE: IN WHAT CAN WE HOPE?"

Address by Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D. Min.

Eleventh Annual Conference

Association for Clinical Pastoral Education - Seattle, Washington

We are survivors. And no one ever said that it was easy to be a survivor.

One incident I recall took place on the Hood Canal in the most promising of all seasons - the Spring. I had been asked to lead a worship service in the chapel in the woods. There we sat on log benches. The ground was damp with wet pine needles. Around us the tall virgin Northwest pines reached to a sky that had finally cleared to blue. But it was a wistful time for us there; we had noted how many of the trees in the chapel area bore the mark of death - the orange fluorescent ties for the tree-fallers. We spoke together of the loss we already felt because this precious (to us) piece of the world would be violently different the next time we came to it. And then we talked. We asked: "Why bother trying to mount church social action projects or change the world at all when life is so tough and we are so fragile?" "What was wrong," asked one, "with simply wanting to tend our own gardens? The world, after all, is a place so full of terror."

An unrelated (yet related) incident. Three weeks ago, in the midst of an ongoing family crisis, I dug great holes in the garden and planted irises for the Spring. That was an act of faith; I would persevere. The Spring would come and, with it, joy.

Our subject is "In What Can We Hope?" My subtitle, this morning, is "On Planting Irises for the Spring."

Social scientists and theologians alike remind us that we live on a globe which is crisis-full. Our morning's topic reminds us of the hopeless ache so many feel about the future - any future. Our inability to believe that we can change the directions of our lives (or the world) condemns us to helplessness. Yet we know that we must actively rescue future possibility by risking active involvement and choice-making in the present. Robert Heilbrunner speaks of the civilizational malaise which we suffer - which makes our hearts heavy.¹ It is that sense, of which John Cobb spoke earlier, wherein we begin to recognize that all the material improvements after which we have sought are failing to satisfy the human spirit and that those efforts may, indeed, be making the world worse.

In his most recent work, Harrison Brown suggests a path which is key to our survival:

...it is essential that we ask what we wish of life beyond the primitive, narrow and unsatisfactory goal of simple survival. Survival for what? What do we want to be? If we had the power and could use it effectively, what would our goals be?

...Today we are children, but finally after a million or so years our childhood is about to end. With the end of childhood three things can happen: we can exterminate our-

"The Future of the Future: In What Can We Hope?"
By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D. Min.

selves; we can go back to the ways of life of our ancestors; we can make a quantum jump upward to a new level of civilization, undreamed of by the philosophers of the past.²

Henry Nelson Wieman speaks of the great divide of, history over which we must pass if we are to "enter the valley of abundance."³ The age in which we live is time-full, event-full, says Ernst Bloch. Time is so full that only two possibilities remain: absolute futility or absolute universality.⁴

The crises proliferate. I do not need to make our hearts heavy now by enumerating lists of the many crises that we face in this age. One issue, of which we have just been made aware illustrates anew, however, the vastness of the problems with which we must deal in order to reach for survival. It was announced, last month, that researchers have discovered that two new strains of pneumonia are resistant to the antibiotics most commonly used against pneumonia. Physicians are left, then, with the option of using drugs which are highly toxic both to the pneumococci and to those who ingest them in many instances. Additionally, a new strain of gonorrhea has also been found to be resistant to penicillin.⁵ While this announcement comes as a shock to many, researchers have been aware that antibiotic resistance has been developing even in those areas of the world where neither antibiotics nor western physicians have been utilized. The result has been that several under-developed regions have had to choose inexpensive but highly toxic agents to kill bacterial strains. In the more affluent nations, however, less toxic but more expensive antibiotic options exist as effective agents against the particular strains of bacteria.

In the face of such overwhelming problems, our hearts grow heavy. Heilbrunner's malaise becomes acutely our own. And all the people hunger for shalom, for God's peace, to become real in this world.⁶ The sense of hopelessness and helplessness swells. When filled with such despair, it is impossible to take action which can be life-saving in our time. We ask: "What does it matter what we do - how can anyone affect the maelstrom around us?" I understand, as you must too, the question of that frightened but honest man who said to me: "All I can do is tend my own garden. The world outside is too terror-filled." We understand because part of us is that hopeless and frightened person too. We, here, also hear his fear all too well because we are men and women who labor in alternative ministries. We often work alone in very hostile environments. We often feel unsupported by our church structures and our colleagues in the parish. We work, you and I, outside the traditional parish in arenas in which the church is not always comfortable - and very often not welcomed.

A small work entitled Disaster, while no longer available, provides insight into the emotional aftershock we experience after a natural disaster.⁷ The study evaluates human responses to cataclysms. Her essay identifies strategies which can be life-saving during the emotional aftershock experienced following a natural disaster - or any profound disaster in our lives. Wolfenstein tells us that victims of disasters can be divided into two groups: non-survivors and survivors. The responses of each group gives us clues about the source of our present human despair and apathy, I think, and about the life-saving actions we must employ.

"The Future of the Future: In What Can We Hope?"
By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D. Min.

The non-survivors become defenseless and unable to save themselves through any action taken in their own behalf. They may withdraw into memories of other times ignoring the calamity which has befallen their lives. Non-survivors often take refuge in delusions. Delusion may take two forms. In one form, the victims develop the belief that the threat is not real or is greatly exaggerated. Their delusions are fed by mutual sharing and assuagement. The second form of delusion is the belief that rescue will come from outside. Both forms of delusion have the effect of restraining the victims from making realistic assessments of the disaster which has occurred and of the way it affects their continued existence. They are unable, therefore, to protect themselves from further harm.

Both these delusionary responses are evident in the statements of individuals we know around us as they evaluate the threats of our age. (I would have expected a much more realistic assessment of those threats from many of them.) You have heard the delusions too:

- "The energy crisis is a fabrication of the OPEC nations."
- "The breakdown of the ozone layer is greatly exaggerated."
- "Our technological ingenuity will find solutions to alleviate world famine."
- "God will rescue us if God chooses."

Wolfenstein claims that survival is possible only if victims first realistically share the scope and the consequences of the calamity with one another. Rather than engaging in mutual assuagement through false hopes, they can then begin to plan life-saving strategy in the light of the new conditions with which they must now live. Thus can individuals find the resources to live within the new limitations. Viktor Frankl has extended the theme by reminding us that, even in the concentration camp, individuals can find options, be transformed and discover meaning and hope.

Today we see many who have turned away from the potential cataclysms of the modern age. There is she who is only concerned for the momentary and her own self-actualization. I fault the church, particularly with regard to the obsessive manner with which so many seek self-actualization as an end. There is he who awaits rescue to a life beyond this world where existence is pictured as safe and peaceful. Again I fault the church for offering and sustaining delusionary visions which place all hope in another world and another time.⁸ There are those who invent sentimental pictures of the past when life seemed so much simpler.

Yet there are those among us who carry on today: facing the harsh realities of our technological world; seeking options within those new realities; finding hope in the most confining of situations; celebrating the meaning which gives purpose to fears and suffering. Hope gives meaning when it is born out of a realistic assessment of what is. Hope is real rather than delusionary, when it grows dialogically with emerging new realities and the perspectives of other survivors. Then the survivors can move toward new dream-goals born out of realism and hope.

"The Future of the Future: In What Can We Hope?"
By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D. Min.

The church, I believe, has special responsibilities for fostering hope: hope which is realistic rather than delusionary. Ernst Bloch and Jürgen Moltmann speak of the power of hope to draw people into the future in theological terms. The church must help people move toward the eschaton. The eschaton is not an other-worldly focus; the eschaton is a dream-goal for this world. It is realistically based, growing out of sharp assessments of the present world yet ever moving toward the new - the fully possible. The church's mission is one which calls people to revolutionary action in behalf of the eschaton - the realistic dreams. Striving after that this-worldly dream, in turn, gives meaning and hope as we move toward the goal. In fact, Moltmann asserts that such revolutionary engagement in this world is the key not only for our survival but also as the way by which the church can recover its identity and sense of mission.

Life is a journey towards knowing, towards a dream, says Bloch.⁹ Because his vision of life as journey means so much to me, personally, I want to share it with you. Dreams or hopes make the dreamer (traveler) restless: the dream pushes the traveler to move out into new territory toward the dream. Each traveler on the road toward knowing (each traveler striking out after the utopian dream) is a dreamer lured by the not-yet - that which is possible but not yet born. Yet any traveler, the dreamer (you or I), overtaking the dream carries a roadmap. The roadmap is a general guide which has a hazy goal and provides direction for the journey. That roadmap is the pooled assessments of the nature of the journey before it is begun. (Remembering the evaluations of Wolfenstein, the roadmap could be the partially understood new realities following a disaster or the recognition that disaster is imminent.) The map, like the realistic dream, must be used as an experimental model. Each journeyer (dreamer) must be prepared to discover new information through experiences encountered along the way. The discoveries are not always easy. Experiences explode old realities with a force that kicks the dreamer (journeyer) toward the new. Bloch's words "explode" and "kick" convey a realism about the nature of change and our shattering new awareness in today's world as we face one catastrophic headline after another.

We would be foolhardy to continue to move toward the goal without acknowledging and being affected by the experiences and the crises of the trip. New knowledge which explodes or gradually unfolds must be assessed. As the road changes and new experiences are encountered, the traveler is transformed. So also is the shape of the dream altered. The goals which pull us forward into the future change. The experimental model is mediated and transformed.¹⁰ So, too, is the traveler changed by the experiences.

And why do we, you and I, expect that our lives in this cataclysmic time would be any different? Any dreamer-traveler in this world must live with hazy goals and new realities which explode our old ways. The way is never smooth. Those dream-goals we hold will be transformed by new realities encountered. So also will we ourselves be changed. The way is never smooth. For all our attempts to understand or anticipate world events, all our pooled knowledge only provides us with partial dream-pictures which must change with new realities. Old dreams are hard to reshape.

"The Future of the Future: In What Can We Hope?"

By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D. Min.

What, then, are my expectations with regard to the future? In what do I hope? What carries me from day to day and allows me to endure the nights, the terror-filled nights, and hope for the sun-filled moments? Interesting to me is the fact that I place humor at the top of my list of factors which allow me to hope for the future. I mean by humor not only the capacity to laugh with myself but also to see the touches of humor in the catclysms about. Often, humor is my saving grace. Recently, a bumper sticker made me laugh over a matter about which Washingtonians feel strongly. The sticker read: "Save our trees - export Dixie Lee Ray." ¹¹

Our growing realism with regard to our fears for the future gives me hope. Reading about the future cannot be classified as light reading these days. Some bioethicists, furthermore, have an amazing ability to find more problems than you can name. Our bioethical discussions often weary the mind and the soul. You name one problem; I can list ten worse. Yet here is a sanity in this kind of insanity. The Seattle headlines read this morning: "Nearly a Third of Washington's Waters are Polluted." ¹² Devastating. Yet I call that headline progress. We know the reality. We care to know. And, because we care to know and face the reality, we have a chance to do something about the pollution. The truth can make us more responsible. And freer. The truth, however painful, allows us the opportunity to make a realistic assessment of what we face so that we can develop strategies for life-saving action.

I take hope in the fact that more of our elected representatives and we citizens have become increasingly more involved in scientific technology review and assessment. We have become less willing to leave research policy and assessment decisions to the professionals with vested interests. Especially is this so in decisions which we believe will affect the commonwealth, the future of the future, and God's future. We are assuming more responsibility as citizens for the review of research protocols. As we meet today, the national ethics advisory board of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare will hold hearings - public hearings - in Seattle on the issue of in vitro fertilization (test-tube babies). While that issue may not strike you as a very important issue, in the long range when placed against the ecological collapse we face, today's hearings strengthen my hope. The hearings are a tangible expression of the greater responsibility we are taking as citizens for decisions which lie outside our normal spheres of interest and expertise.

I look at the wild array of propositions and initiatives upon which citizens across this land were asked to vote in the elections last week and I celebrate. Yes, I agree with those who contend that the many initiatives reflect vested interests. But the very existence of these concrete political issues is an indication to me that more and more of our citizens want to seize control of value issues in this society for whatever reason. We are increasingly reluctant to allow others to decide for us what the shape of our future becoming will be.

I take hope in the fact that we are willing to reshape our individual and collective dreams to adjust to new realities. Even small adjustments are quiet affirmations of our willingness to change and our capacity to reach for new goals. I remember the first time I took the label off a tin can and stamped

"The Future of the Future: In What Can We Hope?"

By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D. Min.

it flat. I remember saying to myself that it probably didn't mean a damn thing in the long run of things. But my flattened tin made a difference to me; for the first time, I was making a personal statement about our global waste. That can affirmed my concern.

A majority of us in King County expressed a willingness in the last election to pay higher taxes to insure that this county - a metropolitan county - will have farmlands for the future. The proposition provided for taxes so that endangered farmlands could be purchased by the county and held as farmlands when present farm owners felt forced to sell to developers. Whether or not that proposition achieves the legally required percentage of votes beyond the simple majority to become law, many of us believe that the majority has said something very specific about stewardship - stewardship which could have very real, tangible costs and very little immediate results.¹³ Here are steps toward and for the future. And, perhaps, if we can take these little steps, we can reach toward the larger dreams and the experimental models. The more reality we bring to our assessments, the more willing we are to strike out after utopian dreams - reach out to dreams of great size, as Bernard Loomer might say.¹⁴ The larger the dreams and the more realistically based, the more willingly we can step out onto the tricky ground of decision-making of which Henry Nelson Wieman speaks. This is the ground where there are no answers, only partial understandings, and little time to weigh the data before decisions must be made. The more our dreams are based in reality as we together understand it, the more willing we will become to sweat for the causes which our dreams demand. We will suffer the sweat, the doubt, the fear, the skepticism for dreams of size.

Meetings such as this give me hope. We are auslanders, you and I, in our concerns as ministers and in the worlds in which we work. The way is hard. Yet we dare to continue, and dare to hope. And, this week, rather than centering upon bread-and-butter issues which make immediate professional survival more secure, you reach for dreams with your conference theme and ask the larger questions. You celebrate and affirm pioneers in the Seattle community whose dream-pictures we need by offering workshops on their ventures: the Chinook learning community and Greenpeace.

Our accomplishments nurture my hope. They are tangible evidence that everything we do or do not do affects all else. We are co-creators of the future. Nothing is ever lost. Nothing is ever lost upon this world which grows and becomes. Nor is anything ever lost upon a God of very great size who also grows and becomes. We need to celebrate our accomplishments even as we measure our shortcomings. Those accomplishments point to the transformations and changes I believe we can create.

Several years ago I, like many of you, worked very hard battling atmospheric nuclear testing. We wrote letters and struggled with technical language we didn't understand. I couldn't comprehend how the Atomic Energy Commission could use the euphemism "sunshine unit" to refer to radiation units (roentgens) which affected our bodies. We didn't picket in those days. But we wrote many protest letters and stormed around and fumed. I never thought it went for much. Then, two years ago, I was asked by the Energy Research and Development Association (ERDA) through Battelle-Northwest, to be one of three philo-

"The Future of the Future: In What Can We Hope?"
By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D. Min.

sopher/theologians to develop an ethical impact statement on nuclear waste management for ERDA. Now that was a mind-blower! That was a sign of hope! Whether anybody read it or not, the fact that someone believed that an ethical impact statement was needed seemed amazing to me. In that capacity, I read the evaluations and prognostications of specialists within the nuclear field (and in ERDA) about the problems of nuclear waste management. In so doing, I discovered something over the long term I could not have known in the short term: what the effect of all those letters had been all those years ago. One nuclear specialist attributed the cessation of our atmospheric testing to the church men and women who wrote letters, made their voices heard, and whose protests changed nuclear policy. The church's direct protests through its clergy and laypersons were the key reason for the policy change identified by that specialist. What an effect to celebrate!

Vietnam is a scar on our lives. While our sense of guilt and the Vietnamese pain continue, the war itself is over. That our involvement in that conflict ceased is greatly attributable to the work of the church and the pioneering efforts of individual travelers toward the dream-goal of peace.

While you are in Seattle, look around you and note our little parks all over town, and the freeways which go nowhere because they end in mid-air. These are all monuments to transformation and to people-effects upon our world. These accomplishments reflect new goals and new values. I celebrate them!

We are survivors! The journey and life itself, like the dreams we hold and the dreamers we are, are in process. There is an ever-movement which fills me with hope. It is a forever process. It is the stubborn fact of existence.¹⁵ All I do affects all else. For me, that awareness gives joy and meaning and direction. I, like you, am a forever effect. I am in relation and affectable: related to and affected by all that is. My community is, therefore, very large: all that is and ever shall be. We are, whether we so choose or not, change agents upon all that is and will be. For nothing is ever lost. And that stubborn fact fills me with hope.

"The Future of the Future: In What Can We Hope?"
By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D. Min.

Footnotes:

¹Robert L. Heilbrunner, An Inquiry Into the Human Prospect (New York: W.W. Norton, 1974). See especially pp. 14-21 wherein Heilbrunner identifies three sources which he believes feed our sense of foreboding: topical events, attitudinal changes, and a civilizational malaise.

²Harrison Brown, The Human Future Revisited: The World Predicament and Possible Solutions (New York: W.W. Norton, 1978), p. 249.

³Henry Nelson Wieman, The Source of Human Good (Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press, 1946), p. 52.

⁴Ernst Bloch describes this era as time-full or event-full - when there is a density of events. Ernst Bloch, A Philosophy of the Future (New York: Herder and Herder, 1970), p. 112 ff. He advances his belief that only two options remain to us: "absolute futility" - when God and human beings are both foiled, or "absolute universality" - wherein the kingdom of heaven becomes absolutely necessary to believe. Ibid., pp. 65-6. Bloch here refers to a kingdom of heaven in this world.

⁵"Antibiotic-resistant Bacteria Spreading", Seattle Times, October 5, 1978. Stanley Falkow, Ph.D., University of Washington, has been one of the most out-spoken scientists concerned with global antibiotic resistance resulting from the introduction of antibiotics in cattle feed in the developed countries. He calls attention to the fact that antibiotic resistance has emerged in under-developed regions of the world where use of antibiotics has been virtually non-existent.

⁶Letty Russell writes movingly of her conception of shalom: the time in the future when all people will know "complete social and physical wholeness and harmony." Letty Russell, Human Liberation in a Feminist Perspective - A Theology (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974), pp. 99 ff.

⁷Martha Wolfenstein, Disaster: A Psychological Essay (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957).

⁸See Jürgen Moltmann, The Experiment Hope (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975) and The Crucified God (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974).

⁹Ernst Bloch, Philosophy. This work dramatically and poetically expands upon the phenomenology of knowing and dreaming.

¹⁰Not only are we and our dreams affectable, continues Bloch, but so also is God. The possibilities of the future, the future of the future (Not-Yet or novum) and the future of God are dependent upon our capacity to reach of large visions - to "strike out" after the dreams. Moltmann would concur. In this sense, the hope theologians echo a theme of process theologians who speak of the consequent nature of God (albeit in different idiom).

"The Future of the Future: In What Can We Hope?"
By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D. Min.

Footnotes:

¹¹ At the time of this address Dixie Lee Ray, governor of the State of Washington, had developed an infamous reputation among ecologists and environmentalists as one who chose economic progress and political expediency over environmental protection and stewardship.

¹² Headlines, Seattle Times, November 9, 1978.

¹³ The churches of Washington State were particularly vocal in the campaign in support of this proposition calling the issue a matter of stewardship for the future. It was with a particularly heavy heart I read Pope John Paul II's cautionary remarks to his Latin American priests on the occasion of the opening of the bishops conference in Puebla, Mexico since I delivered this address. I had long looked to the political activism of Latin American priests as the advance revolutionary agents of the church calling us to action in behalf of the eschaton. Here now was the Pope criticizing the theology of liberation and asking his priests to "abstain from political action". In so doing, he was asking his clergy to forego revolutionary action, in contrast, to which the stance of Washington State churches on farmlands seem very minor indeed although effective. See, "Keep Church Out of Politics, Pope Warns Latin Bishops", The Seattle Times, January 29, 1979.

¹⁴ Grateful appreciation is here noted to Bernard Loomer for his notion of size which has so deeply affected my thinking and writing especially as here expressed. See Bernard M. Loomer, "S-I-Z-E", Criterion (Chicago: The Divinity School of the University of Chicago, Spring 1974).

¹⁵ Process theologians and philosophers will recognize this term as the succinct and expressive voice of Alfred North Whitehead.

"THE FUTURE'S FUTURE: OUR RESPONSIBILITY"

Address by Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D. Min.
Eleventh Annual Conference - November 1978

Association for Clinical Pastoral Education - Seattle, Washington

This morning, I reflect upon the nature of our responsibility to the future. What do we owe our children's children? If a duty to our children's children exists, how much does such a duty outweigh other duties we may have in the present? When I speak of our children's children, I refer to the generations that will issue long after our children. My concept of future extends far, very far into the future.

In order to help us consider my perspective about our responsibility to the future, I turn now to two subjects in my area of interest--bioethics. Obviously, I believe that the subjects are connected to our topic today. These subjects suggest, I believe, a paradigm by which we can weigh the nature of our responsibility to the future and the degree to which that responsibility should affect our actions in the present. The subjects are: 1) the right to refuse treatment (even when dying), and 2) the right to informed consent.

The right of the dying patient to refuse treatment is an issue which receives attention in our media, in our courts and, increasingly, in our legislatures. The legislative push to affirm the dying's right to choose a natural death is primarily a drive for the continuing privacy and right to self-determination even when dying. That is, the dying patient has the continuing right to remain in control of his/her destiny. From the experiences of our various ministries (especially the wide diversity represented here today), we know the fears from which the discussion about the right of the dying patient to refuse treatment emanates. People fear prolonged dying--postponement of death through the interventions now available. They fear that they will be kept from the decision-making arena (which is, after all, their own) about their own care by the staff. Still more often, they fear that their families will want to protect them from the knowledge that they are dying and so deny them the right to make decisions in their own behalf. There is, as well, the fear of people that they may not be conscious to make choices about their care at the critical time when it is important to do just that. Especially is this fear persuasive among health care professionals and those who have experienced the prolonged dying of their peers and loved ones. Especially is this concern overwhelming to those who fear their own long-term institutionalization and debilitation or those who have chronic or degenerative disabilities. For example, those with certain genetic disabilities know that their diagnosis means that, sometime in the future, they will be dying from that disease yet not then lucid to make decisions about their care. Or they may be lucid but unable to speak for themselves because of their physiological deterioration. To illustrate, a Huntington's Chorea knows 15 years in advance the kind of dying process that awaits. He/she watched, after all, the steady deterioration caused by the disease as older family members died.¹ They know that they will not be able to communicate to others the kind of care they wish when their own death is imminent.

"The Future's Future: Our Responsibility"

By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D. Min.

We, here, also know that the concern about one's right to refuse treatment and the drive for natural death legislation arise out of the recognition that living wills are not legally enforceable. They simply carry a moral force which family and staff may consider at the time of our dying. Furthermore, we know that it is difficult to convey to others exactly what we mean when try to describe in legal language the circumstances under which we no longer wish active treatment. We know that, once we have reached majority age, we always have the right to refuse treatment. We refuse treatment all the time. We become non-compliant patients, for example, who do not take our medications or lose weight. We can choose never to see a physician. We can leave the hospital whenever we choose, even against medical advice (AMA), if we are willing to sign that very coercive AMA form releasing the hospital of liability. We don't even have to go to see a physician when we find a lump on our breast or try to reduce stress levels in our lives when we feel recurring chest pains. We can ignore symptoms or choose the treatment plan which suits us rather than our physician.

When we are dying, however, all these options change. Once admitted to a hospital and diagnosed as terminally ill, that capacity--that right--to refuse treatment for some reason comes into question. It is often as if an unwritten code stated that patients, when dying, are so debilitated that they can no longer be considered competent to make decisions in their own behalf. Our actions certainly reflect that bias!

I believe that the dying have special needs to be protected because they are usually not in a position to protect their rights themselves. Especially is this so in the instance of their right to refuse treatment. They often are too sick, frightened or debilitated to refuse treatment or leave the hospital. So I believe we need special legal vehicles which affirm the individual's continuing right to refuse active treatments even when dying. In so doing we, as a society, will affirm a patient's continuing right to self-determination and our continuing respect for that patient as a person who is yet competent, even while dying, to make decisions on care.² And this is the underlying theme in the movement toward the natural death act: the affirmation that individuals have the right to privacy and self-determination even though dying. Further, such legislation affirms that we, as a society, have a special duty to protect the rights of those who cannot protect themselves.³

Now let us move to the second subject of import to our theme this morning: informed consent. And herein lies a paradigm which speaks to the question: "What is our responsibility to the future?" Our notions about the right to informed consent and what constitutes informed consent have become increasingly more sophisticated in recent years.

In 1947, we had the first formal articulation of the right to informed consent in human experimentation. That is really recent history. The atrocities of the Third Reich included the use of human subjects for experimentation without their consent. The individuals who had conducted the experiments claimed no moral responsibility because they were following orders during the War. But, the code stated that there was a higher law than that of the state. That individuals had a responsibility to a

"The Future's Future: Our Responsibility"
By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D.Min.

moral law even in time of acute danger (national crisis or war). That moral law to which we were responsible placed limitations upon what we could do to other human beings even when acting under military orders. In this instance, the code and the military tribunal affirmed that biomedical subjects must give their consent. The Nuremburg Code stated: "...the voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential."⁴ Underlying the statement is an affirmation of the principle of respect for persons. What is so startling to me now, is the fact that this was the first such formal enunciation in a society which prizes self-determination.

Informed consent affirms the right of the individual to privacy and to free choice--to be self-determining. To be informed means that the individual has sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the medical procedure involved: possible beneficial and harmful effects; alternative therapies available; potential results if no therapies were used at all. Consent means that the patient/subject has voluntarily chosen to participate or not participate in a research protocol or treatment and has reached that decision without coercion.

In the 1947 Nuremburg statements, there was no discussion about proxy consent for the child or a legally incompetent person. The issue of proxy consent was finally addressed in the Declaration of Helsinki under the aegis of the World Health Organization in 1964. The declaration states that a legal guardian can give consent for medical procedures in behalf of another who is legally incompetent.

The right to informed consent as it has so recently been developed, then, affirms our respect for one another and our right to self-determination and privacy to the fullest degree possible. Further, it infers a positive responsibility. We have the responsibility (duty) to protect the right of others to informed consent and to protect them from harm by ensuring their self-determination. Over the years, we have developed greater sophistication about the complexity of achieving consent which is informed and uncoerced. For example, those of us (especially clergy) who work in any institutional setting are very aware that achieving truly informed consent is not an easy task. A patient's signature on a consent form is not an adequate measure despite what medical associations or the medical records department may think. We know that informing a patient and receiving their consent is a process. Gradually the patient or subject becomes aware of what is taking place in their body. The reality of that information and the implications of the treatment plans that the physician/researcher offers assumes meaning for the patient over a period of time. Informed judgments take time.

Thus, we have become more aware of informed consent as a process. So, also, we have just begun to recognize that there are individuals among us who need special protection with regard to their right to informed consent. Especially is this true in biomedical research among the poor, the uneducated, the institutionalized. We have read in recent years, of gross violations of human rights in the name of biomedical research. I call to mind now several instances in which the right to informed consent has been flagrantly violated.

"The Future's Future: Our Responsibility"

By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D.Min.

Do placebos prevent pregnancy? This was the central question a researcher in San Antonio addressed.⁵ The experiment he conducted was upon Chicano women who went to a family planning center there seeking contraceptives. Without their knowledge, seventy-six women were given placebos while others received various contraceptives. They were neither informed that they were given placebos nor told that they had become research subjects. In other words, these women thought they were taking birth control pills to prevent pregnancy. Of course, you know what happened: the normal percentage of unprotected women became pregnant--ten in this instance.

What is yet more surprising about this case is that the researcher did not see anything unethical about that experiment. He reported his results to his colleagues at the American Fertility Society meetings. He published his finding: taking sugar pills had no affect on whether one got pregnant or not; there was no physiological or psychological placebo effect. When indignantly asked by a colleague how he could have conducted such an experiment upon women without their consent, the researcher commented only that "we could have aborted them if the abortion statute in Texas weren't in limbo right now." He ignored the fact that these Chicano women may not have viewed abortion as an option.

Another flagrant violation occurred here in Washington State. The research staff was housed in one of our finest hospitals on "Pill" Hill. That staff was involved in the radiation of the testes of prisoners. There was no discussion with those prisoners about the possible effects of that radiation with regard to sterilization and/or infertility.

From such instances, we more readily recognize that, in our quest for scientific knowledge, we somehow overlook the needs and rights of human subjects. We have become more sensitive to our special responsibility to protect people who cannot protect themselves. You know who they are better than I; many of you work with them. They are the institutionalized, the prisoners, the mentally ill, those debilitated because they are dying. They are the young children who cannot speak for themselves. There are a host of those who cannot speak in their own behalf, including the fetus or the comatose like Quinlan. The purpose of the Ethics Advisory Board hearings in Seattle's Federal Building this week centers upon our recognition that there are those who cannot give their informed consent and, therefore, need special protection from society--from us.

There are several recent trends with regard to informed consent which are especially illuminating given our topic this morning. Those trends expose with greater clarity our responsibility to protect others--especially those who cannot protect themselves. One trend is the appointment of the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects in Biomedical and Behavioral Research. This Commission, mandated by Congress, was appointed in 1971 by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (DHEW). The starting point for that Commission was the preliminary guidelines established by DHEW governing the use of human subjects. The Commission has since concluded its work and additional tasks are being assigned elsewhere. Two points seem important to me as we review the task of that Commission and consider our own responsibility to the future:

"The Future's Future: Our Responsibility"
By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D.Min.

First, the Commission's mandate was to evaluate the special problems of prisoners, the mentally ill, the fetus and the child--those individuals who need special protection in biomedical and behavioral research. It was to evaluate the research setting and the circumstances in which they were used as biomedical or behavioral research subjects. The Commission was to determine how the value of the research protocol could be weighed against human risks and how the human rights of the subjects ought to be protected.

Second, the makeup of the Commission was interdisciplinary from the beginning, representing us as a society. In so doing, Congress affirmed the right and the responsibility of the public to have access to the members as our representatives on that Commission. The hearings, the testimony and the guidelines were to be developed not only in public view but also with public input (like our hearings here this week). The interdisciplinary makeup of the Commission meant that commissioners were not only scientific researchers and physicians but also public policy experts, theologians, lawyers, bioethicists. So control over the guidelines developed for use of human subjects was not left to those with vested interests.

Before we turn to the central question before us today about the nature of our responsibility to the future, there is a second aspect in our changing views about informed consent and protecting those who cannot protect themselves which seems important to me. This second aspect has to do with proxy consent of the parents for the child. Traditionally in our society, parents have been able to give consent to medical treatment for a minor child. This right did not emanate out of a concern for the child. Traditionally, we have acknowledged this parental prerogative because the child has been viewed as property, and because the parent had to assume any financial damages which might arise because of harm to that child.⁶

However, we have begun to re-evaluate the absolute right of the parent to give consent for the child. Does the parent always speak in the child's best interest? We have become concerned, for example, about child abuse. We are keenly aware that there are children who must be protected from their parents. Further, I have been involved in medical and governmental discussions in the Province of British Columbia regarding the mentally retarded minor and sterilization. In this country, too, we are increasingly more sensitive to the fact that a parent's request to have their mentally retarded child sterilized cannot be assumed to be in the best interest of that child. The parent may be serving his/her own personal interests first. The parents may be concerned that the adolescent daughter will become pregnant or wishing to avoid managing menstruation.

In another arena, we are aware that the parent may be caught between the needs of two siblings: such may be the case when the kidney of one child is needed for the second. So the court has begun to intervene by evaluating special circumstances in which a parent gives proxy consent for a child. The court, itself, is willing to evaluate the appropriate course for that child in the light of three tests:

"The Future's Future: Our Responsibility"
By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D.Min.

1. The court uses substituted judgment. It asks: what is reasonable? What would a prudent person in a similar situation decide?
2. The court will consider what is in the best interest of the child in a particular situation.
3. The court will ask: what is fair and reasonable in these circumstances?⁷

The court is increasingly more likely to enter what was once viewed as solely the parent's decision-making arena especially in the following circumstances: when controversy exists about what constitutes appropriate care for the child or the greater the degree of risk to which the child is to be subjected for either a therapeutic or non-therapeutic procedure.

Assessing the degree of risks to which others are subjected is a complicated task. Responsibility for risk assessment, as we have seen, has been left heretofore to those in the research setting or to the family. Yet the complexities of such assessment, we have seen, are increasingly more apparent to us. Our brief review of the Nuremburg Trials, human subject use and the rights of the parents to give proxy consent, illustrate steps we are taking to ensure that that risk is responsibly assessed in behalf of the patient/subject and in behalf of the public as a whole.

Yesterday afternoon several of us discussed a hard, practical dilemma which can arise even when good risk evaluations have taken place. We asked: what do you (the researcher or the chaplain in a research setting) do when you have been awarded research monies and begun your research only to discover later that the risks, as you have assessed them, are greater than they seemed? This was the tough issue which recombinant DNA researchers who had their monies and had begun their projects became concerned that the risks not only to the research staff but also to society as a whole might be greater than earlier evaluated.

In a letter to colleagues, they asked for an opportunity to re-evaluate those risk possibilities together. They themselves placed their research under a moratorium until operational guidelines for conducting that research could be developed and until procedures which seemed risky were identified. Following an initial national meeting at Asilomar to develop those initial guidelines, researchers agreed not to undertake certain experiments until a bacterial strain which was fail-safe was developed. What they sought was a strain that could not survive outside the laboratory. They honored that moratorium for several years and held their research in voluntarily abeyance until the strain was developed.⁸ A national committee was established to develop and further refine the guidelines.

What seems important to me about that very responsible effort in risk evaluation is that those researchers (and the public with them) said in effect: "There is some research risks minimal enough to continue.

"The Future's Future: Our Responsibility"

By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D. Min.

However, there is other research whose long-term consequences are enough in doubt, not only to this generation, but also to future generations that that research should not be undertaken at this point." The national committee which developed the recombinant DNA research guidelines continues now to monitor those guidelines and that research. It is concerned with evaluation of risks for procedures which might affect those (us or our grandchildren) who cannot speak individually for themselves.

Many hearings developed around the recombinant DNA research: in the California State Legislature, on the Cambridge (Mass.) City Council and at the University of Washington. These hearings all attest to a new sense of responsibility: the public as well as scientific researchers and public policy experts are now beginning to acknowledge our collective responsibility to protect not only ourselves, our tribe, this country, but also this globe and future generations. Our sense of community has grown. Our sense of responsibility to that community has extended our notions about informed consent and our duty to evaluate what is in the best interests of those who cannot speak for themselves. Especially is this essential, I believe, in biomedical research and scientific technology assessment which have a high potential for affecting our common weal. Moreover, we have begun to define common weal more and more largely; our sense of community has extended horizontally and vertically. The size of our community has grown to include the future's becoming.

We have noted several trends in biomedical issues: the right to refuse treatment even when dying (that is, the right to self-determination and privacy); the right to informed consent; the rights of those who cannot protect their own destinies and privacy. With our growing sophistication about those rights, we have also developed a sharper sense about the nature of our responsibility to one another. We have a duty to protect those who cannot protect themselves in biomedical, behavioral and scientific research. We might say that we have an obligation to safeguard other people's right to self-determination--so that they can be as self-determining as they are fully able to be. Now, in such instances as recombinant DNA research, we are beginning to acknowledge our collective responsibility to safeguard the right to self-determination of future generations to the degree we are able. Conversely, we are beginning to recognize that there is a duty not to take steps in the present which we believe might impinge negatively upon those who come after us.

I have said that the shape of the future rests very much on the size and the reality in which our dreams are grounded. I have said that I believe that no thing is ever lost. No action is ever lost. All that is, is. I extend that point further, now. I believe, as well, that that which is not done also has a forever effect which transforms all that is and all that will be. Now that may seem like a very heavy burden to some--knowing that what one does not do has such an effect.

Such an awareness is not burdensome to me. For me, the sense that all I do (or do not do) has a forever effect is a gift. It is a gift because I am speaking now of our capacity to shape the future of the future--and of our ongoingness.

"The Future's Future: Our Responsibility"

By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D.Min.

Now, I take myself with enough realism and the humor which we mentioned yesterday to know that, most of the time, I don't act very responsibly. That is, I suppose, the nature of reality and of humanhood. Yet, I strongly believe that, in some of these larger issues with which we are concerned at this conference, we as clergy and we as the Church have a very specific responsibility with regard to the future of the future which we must take very seriously.

The Church and the clergy are powerful persuaders as individuals and as denominations. But we are most powerful when we act, not singly, but as the gathered community. I believe that our central task, the central mission of the church, is political activism: political activism which opens the possibilities for the future's becoming.

We have spent much energy in the Church, in recent years, nurturing and developing the Church as a therapeutic community. But, like many, I've begun to look upon these therapeutic communities as just so many Noah's arks.⁹ We have these wonderful nurturing vessels sailing off on their own totally oblivious of the world beyond their arks. Now, I will agree that the nurturing and empowering of the individuals--the celebration of the self--are important tasks of the Church. We want churches to be communities in which self-empowerment and nurture take place; but surely not for our own sakes alone. These are tools to be used in behalf of causes larger than self-discovery and affirmation alone. There is something more that we should be about.

For me, that something else is a renewed sense of purpose and committed action toward our vision of what can become. Political activism is central. I do not believe that change must always be evolutionary. Sometimes, I think that change comes (has to come) in revolutionary explosions which kick us into new awarenesses and responses as Bloch has described. I think that the Church has to be central in the mission of striving to overtake our large dreams of what can be--the eschaton. I believe that our responsibility as church men and women is to become advocates for the future. Our first responsibility is considering what might be in the best interests of that future. We, this generation, are giving proxy consent for that future whether we actively do so or not. We have a responsibility to open the way so that the novel of which John Cobb has just spoken can emerge; so that the future can become most fully what it can become.

At the very least, it is our responsibility to avoid that which we believe may place obstacles before that future or those actions whose consequences we cannot posit. We know that many of our actions today will present obstacles which the future will have to confront like so much space-age debris now orbiting our globe.

Our responsibility as the institutional church and as clergy is to fulfill our roles as powerful persuaders, as reachers after dreams. And the central mission is activism in behalf of that future. What does that mean? For me, it means that we must be open to the new and the possible. It means that our concepts of the church, faith, and theology must change. It means that we must move beyond fossilized

"The Future's Future: Our Responsibility"
By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D.Min.

theology. We need theologies which allow (push?) our visions to grow. We need theologies which themselves grow and are affectable--changed by other ways of knowing and experiences along the way. It means that we must be willing to look at other people's dream pictures (the dream pictures of the economist, the political analyst, the third world citizen) and allow their dream pictures (their pieces of the road map) to expand our own. Then, together, I think we can reach for the new syntheses we need to overtake those visions--that future.

To respond with political activism in behalf of the future means that we must redefine faith; faith is not blind devotion but born in the real and the potentially real. Faith, for me, is an activator not a tranquilizer.

If we are to be responsive and effective in such political missions, we must also be more realistic as church people; we cannot save every front. We cannot even work on every issue. We must choose. And then, we must be willing to educate ourselves and our people so that we and they enter the political arenas with knowledge and tools. We cannot all be Stephens without a sword.¹⁰ In fact, I believe we must not lose ourselves totally in every fight; we must save ourselves for other days and other work.

We, as church women and men, must be responsible to the future. In so doing, we will have to give up some foolish notions. In my own denomination, we have placed heavy emphasis upon the freedom of the individual to choose and to act in ways which are congruent with personal belief. We place heavier weight upon the work of the scattered community. This is the concept that the individual church member engages in those arenas in the community which have special significance for her or him. We usually encourage social activism by individuals rather than as a gathered community working together. So, I contend, we often sacrifice our collective responsibility on the altar of individual freedom. I see this happening in other denominations as well as my own. But we live in a systems world. It is important to take individual stands. But if we cannot work together as a gathered community in a systems world, our voices (voice) will be lost.

I think we need to be realistic about the costs of this kind of revolutionary action in behalf of the future--the utopian dream--shalom. There is a cost for such action in our own lives and in our churches. Taking stands as a gathered community means members will be lost. Activism can mean reduced budgets when we take stands. Last week, I spent time with a very small congregation in a conservative county in this State. The congregation has no minister. They have survived a very long time as a vital congregation. I asked the members of the congregation to consider with me which should be given the heavier weight: our freedom or our responsibility as a covenanted society? One of the members said that the cost was so high when the congregation took a politically active stand together: "We'll lose members if we take collective stands." That is true. But I believe that the costs for not entering the political arena are too great. We will lose money. We will be bruised. And we cannot responsibly ask our congregations to enter such costly fronts

"The Future's Future: Our Responsibility"
By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D.Min.

without helping one another appraise the cost and without supporting one another to the fullest degree possible. We will lose money. We will be bruised. Yet, we as a church, can support one another. The alternative is silence and inactivism. And the long term costs far too dear for the future.

Finally, I believe that we responsible church women and men must offer the church as a place for nourishment when the spirit flags. The church must become a retooling center when dreams which have been kicked by new realities need to be reshaped: a source of new insight and an arena for the mediation of new awarenesses.

We are the only witnesses and advocates in behalf of the future. We will make decisions whether we choose to make them or simply allow them to take place without our intervention. And those decisions will affect the future. We will have to make our choices and take steps in behalf of that future in a state of moral indeterminacy. That is ever true; decisions are made with only partial pictures of what is and what can be. But let us take seriously our responsibility. Let us celebrate our gift: our sense that nothing is ever lost.

May our action in these days, to the degree each of us is able, speak in behalf of that future. We are its guardians, its partial creators. Then the future of the future may be more fully what it can become.

"The Future's Future: Our Responsibility"

By Jane A. Boyajian Raible, D.Min.

Footnotes:

¹Huntington's Chorea is a dominant genetic disorder. Each child of a choreic parent has a 1:1 risk of being affected by the disease. The affected individual does not show symptoms indicating that she/he is affected until 25-55 years of age. This means that the victim's children have usually had their own children and, unknowingly, may have transmitted the same risk to their children.

²For fuller discussion see Jane A. Raible, "The Right to Refuse Treatment and Natural Death Legislation", Medicolegal News 5:4 (Fall 1977).

³Karen Lebacqz and Robert J. Levine discuss the dehumanizing aspect of protecting others in their article, "Respect for Persons and Informed Consent to Participate in Research", Clinical Research 25 (1977): 101-7. We can protect others so much that we violate their own right to self-determination.

⁴Secretary of the Army, "The Twelve Nuremburg Trials Under Law No. 10", Final Report to the Secretary of the Army on the Nuremburg War Crimes Trials Under Control Council Law No. 10 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1949).

⁵Robert M. Veatch, "'Experimental' Pregnancy", Hastings Center Report 1:1 (June 1971). The researcher, Dr. Joseph Goldzieher developed this project in order to establish, "...whether some of the reported side effects of The Pill were physiological or psychological."

⁶A highly informative discussion of the concept of informed consent can be found in George J. Annas, Leonard H. Glantz and Barbara F. Katz, Informed Consent to Human Experimentation: The Subject's Dilemma (Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing, 1977). The author is grateful to that source for much of the discussion on informed consent which follows herein.

⁷Ibid., p. 89.

⁸This exciting chapter in American scientific research is detailed in June Goodfield's Playing God (New York: Random House, 1977).

⁹I particularly relish Jurgen Moltmann's use of this phrase as an apt description of the church solely centered upon becoming a therapeutic community.

¹⁰Acts 7.

"WOMEN IN CPE"

Address by Sister Chris Bennett, S.S.S.
November 1978 - Eleventh Annual Conference
Association for Clinical Pastoral Education - Seattle, Washington

As I am greeting you today here in Seattle, the "Great Northwest", there's an international conference going on at Baltimore's Civic Center. It's the Second Women's Ordination Conference. It has a profound significance to me and to many men and women for, in some way, it says that there is hope for the full recognition of women's talents and gifts.

Speaking of recognition reminds me of something that happened to me when I was flying into Seattle. At the time, I wasn't particularly anxious to be recognized. The plane was packed and late. I finally got a seat by the window and was hoping for a bit of peace.

The plane was airborne when the man on the aisle seat leaned over to address the man in the center seat as well as myself. "Say, would either of you like a drink?" he asked. The man next to me said, "No", and I said, "No, thank you," and continued to look out the window ignoring them. Then the man on the aisle leaned over again to get my attention and said, "I bet you're a nun?" I was disturbed that my identity may be showing, so I retorted, "What makes you think that!?" "Oh," he said, "I can tell them a mile away. I used to be a Christian Brother. But you probably won't like it, I mean the reason I can tell them a mile away. They all look so pale." I still wasn't going to give this stranger the satisfaction of knowing that I was a Sister until the man in the center aisle then said, "Well, are you or aren't you a nun? I'm an atheist and I'd hate to be sitting between the two of you if that's the case." At that point, I decided to tell them. "Well, as a matter of fact, I am a nun," I said. The atheist said, "Oh, my God, I think we all better have a drink." And so we did!

The world we have before us is filled with such humor. It is filled with excitement and positive challenge. As one well-known author phrases it:

"The road that stretches before the feet of a person is a challenge to the heart long before it tests the strength of the legs."

This morning, I would like to talk to you about the challenge as it regards your ministry and as it relates to women in ministry today. The very concept of ministry has several possible meanings.

Ministry is----actively participating in the mission of Jesus
by sharing life, truth, freedom and love
by helping to shape the world into His kingdom.

Ministry is----presence, listening; it includes
enabling people to solve their own problems,
make their own choices,
meet their own needs, and
forge their own destinies.

Ministry is----responding to the cry of the poor.

Ministry is----participating in Jesus' work of redemption.

Ministry is----discovering Christ's presence in the world rather than "bringing" Christ to the world.

And women, a barely tapped resource of power and effectiveness can, with help, share a vital role in this ideal of ministry.

All four evangelists agree that women were the first witnesses to, and the first preachers of the Resurrection. Jesus showed Himself to a woman, Mary Magdalene. He instructed Mary to tell the Apostles the good news of the Resurrection. Mary, the mother of Jesus, also serves as a role model for our ministry. It was she who gave us Jesus. To all women in all ages she says, "Only I could decide to accept the challenge, to take the risk. I accepted fully, completely. The risk was mine."

No longer can our reality reflect a warped image of masculine-feminine roles. Unfortunately, media insists on limiting and narrowing women's roles to super-mother, super-wife, super-sister, super-sex symbol, and super-psychic when it comes to other people's needs. Propelled by this image women, too often guilt-ridden, frantically try to be all things to all people, only to find themselves trapped in a cultural quicksand from which they are desperately trying to free themselves. But like the media, cultural barriers within ecclesial as well as societal structures refuse to allow women total freedom. "Is freedom just another name for nothing left to lose?" Questions?---there are so many of them. And I am always reminded of questions I find so difficult to answer. "Why can't I find my identity in the one place I have a right to look for it? Why will no one listen to my voice in the Church? In the midst of all its promises, why does my Church continue to treat me as a second class citizen?"

Some women ask, "Why must my talents be limited to cooking or parish affairs and why am I praised only for raffle ticket sales?" Women Religious ask, "Why can I govern thousands in universities and hospitals and still not qualify for a sub-committee in Rome?" Women ministers question why religious education jobs are the primary positions available to them after ordination. Women in CPE ask, "Why am I the only woman in my CPE group and why are there only token women on ACPE committees? Why are there so few ACPE women supervisors?" How long can women remain silent while the men in the Church attempt to make decisions that govern our entire beings? So many questions. Scripture instructs there is neither male nor female, Jew nor Greek slave or free men. We are all one--one in Christ Jesus.

Born into a culture in which women lived in virtual slavery, Jesus imparted to these very women certain truths of Christianity. For example, it was to the woman of Samaria that Jesus revealed the true nature of God and His own mission as Messiah.

For those who become liberated in Christ, there is no competition or manipulation: it is freedom, life fully alive, empowerment to witness, and surely life transformed. Yet, it does cost us. The cost of discipleship in the complex structure of our society demands decisions and deeper commitments than ever before by each of us men and women. For today's woman, to risk the impossible, is to dare in the name of justice, to have a voice and to claim the dignity of simple human recognition.

Address by Sister Chris Bennett

It is a risk that is only possible because there is a maturing, compassionate network of men and women in CPE, in pastoral ministry and in the arts and professions who view with alarm the alternatives for a society which is schizophrenic about the place of its men and women, and in the attitudes and actions which it imposes. For there are no answers for men and women split from each other. More and more we realize that, while the women's movement represents a necessary and valid voice, the solution is not in separation from the rest of society. Such a split of men from women in decisional activities leads to a sick society.

Caught in this double bind, men and women alike are trapped in a separatist bondage. It's easy to talk about the things we are committed to but difficult to convey the commitment itself. We need the mutuality of loving care and support. But how do we go about extending the caring spirit of Jesus? We do this by developing between men and women supportive, healing, open, trusting relationships in which we and others are free to love and be loved.

Let us begin by healing each other--by nourishing both masculine and feminine qualities and also those human qualities we hold in common. How can we do it? This can be accomplished by responding openly with the most precious gift that we all possess, the gift of our own uniqueness. It is this gift which speaks and witnesses to our spirituality, our caring, our empowering, and our wholeness. It is our uniqueness which speaks in specific words--which touches individual lives and through which each of us loves in special ways.

As I stand here looking out at each of your faces, I know that in every person there is a unique history. Each of you, in your own life, has worked out certain answers and each of you has dreamed and struggled in a human way through the questioning. Each of you has taken risks, met challenges, and known the joys and the sorrows of people who love. Has anyone told you that you are born to share your gifts? Well, I'm telling you that your gifts are unique and awesome and that only you can give them.

Think for a minute of all the people you have loved. While you're thinking, let me remind you that because you have loved them, you have given them life. You have done it not as your best friend would, nor as your next-door neighbor would, nor even as your father or mother would. You have done it in your own unique way. In so doing, you have given the ultimate gift--you have given yourself. I deeply respect each of you for being this kind of person. I'm impressed by the infinite variety of riches that you represent, by your responses through your differences, finally by your sharing them in love with all those you meet.

For ministers and co-workers with women in ministry--women who have been treated as second-class citizens--such loving support is essential. Also, there exists a need to relinquish some of the non-directive attitudes toward women and to exercise, with discretion, what I call persuasive force. This is so necessary because of the low self-image of many women as leaders in our society. Today is a very special day to me. I'm so much in touch with the men in CPE who have helped me to grow through such persuasive force. They have been men Religious like Jim who, when I lacked theological training, challenged and assigned me to do adult inquiry classes for thirty-two people in Oregon City. He had confidence in me before I had it in myself.

There was Ed who asked me to take over his therapy group for suicidal personalities, when I didn't have the confidence that I could do it. I remember his saying, "Well, why don't you read this article to this suicidal group and ask them to respond? You could at least do that, couldn't you, Chris?" As my interest grew in these people, I began reading their folders and getting deeply involved in their lives and their concerns. Slowly and surely I was being primed in the therapist role for a group of persons who were both suicidal and alcoholic.

Then there was Art, the Director of the Board of the Community Crisis Center in SD who challenged me to the hilt to take responsibility for a new and exciting agency, the Community Crisis Center, run by 180 volunteers and eleven paid staff. "Chris," he said, "why did you leave the meeting early and go home? We elected you the first new Director of the Crisis Center." My face fell a foot, as he blithely said, "You can do it!" When time elapsed and I had not yet confirmed my appointment as Director it was Mel, my consultant and colleague, who gently prodded me in his soft-spoken manner to take the helm of this innovative agency and challenge the city of SD to respond to the needs of the community for an emergency night-time service since the structure had failed to meet the many needs of people and an alternate method needed to be devised--highly personalized and with a minimum of red tape--as our motto indicated, "Our Thing is People". For we believed we had a commitment and a capacity to be a free force, an honest mirror, a gadfly and a leaven within the SD community to advocate or "go to bat" for people in need.

After the Crisis Center experience, I went back to the Parish where I was invited by another CPE minister to work in Program for Pastoral Training. Leo shielded me some from the men who didn't want me in seminary education until I was strong enough to go on my own. In recent years, it has been the Bobs and Vernons who have challenged my growth.

And on the Accreditation Committee, the Wendells, Lens and Earls who had more confidence in me than I did in myself. I remember Earl saying, "We've all taken our turn as chairperson in the accreditation process, Chris. It's your turn!"

At this point, I don't know who it was exactly that got me here to Seattle, but this is "a heavy". For it was less than eight years ago, while I was working in a little city, that an interfaith ministerial group asked me to leave a meeting because they didn't want any Catholics present. As I said, I'm not sure who all the people were who have made it possible for me to stand before you today, but it is to those persons in my life who have used persuasive force and have taken risks with me, that I am grateful. It is for you that I hold deep respect as I ask you to continue to challenge other women who, because of familial and cultural drawbacks, are just not that sure of themselves. I promise you that, in this spirit of looking out for the other and working toward growth in person and ministry, CPE will develop and flourish.

Notwithstanding the inherent greatness of men and women within the field of CPE, I do observe some limiting aspects to Clinical Pastoral Education. As supervisors, we are so interpersonally involved with our students in hospitals, prisons, and other institutions that we forget that most students will become parish ministers in a rural, suburban or urban setting. Pastoral ministry in these settings demands much more than an integrated person's approach.

Address by Sister Chris Bennett

Work in the city demands a different setting, stronger formation in social justice, in human relations, in group process and in minority group relations. The Advanced CPE students must be able to grasp the centrality of social justice issues, as well as be supportive of them and open to the new directions to which they lead.

The emphasis of Jesus' ministry was to announce the good news not merely to the affluent but to the poor, the outcasts, the alienated, the powerless. He announced His intention at the beginning of His ministry when He read Isaiah's revelation of God's love:

"The spirit of the Lord has anointed me to preach the good news to the poor, liberation to the captives, recovery of sight to the blind, and to set free the oppressed."

Throughout His ministry, Christ identified Himself with the "least important brothers and sisters--the hungry, the naked, the thirsty, the stranger, the homeless, the sick and the imprisoned". These are the ones with whom the ministers of Christ have been called to stand alongside, for whom to advocate. In relation to these brothers and sisters, the Christian either finds his/her life or loses it.

The advocacy role, therefore, is not an optional matter for us in ministry. It is one expression of life. The oppressed, the alienated and the outcasts need help. They need love as individuals and justice as groups. To be an advocate means to help make it possible for persons and groups to experience their essential dignity as sons and daughters of God and the justice that should be afforded all people--black, white; rich, poor; farmworker, grower; employee, employer; gay, straight; male or female.

In our ministerial efforts to ease tension between such groups, we may attempt piously to aim toward reconciliation, but we can easily forget that reconciliation without advocacy is not real. As I see it, authentic reconciliation only occurs between groups who see and treat each other with dignity. Advocacy prepares the way for reconciliation. But reconciliation is not the only answer. Are we only going to be involved in binding wounds of people that hurt, rather than undertaking the task of education for social justice in Advanced CPE? We need to affect far reaching change. We need to prepare qualified leaders who are not only personally integrated and clinically competent, but who dare to risk changing social structures which violate people. Presently, we help people cope with the systems, rather than attack the systems that affect their lives. Until self-interest is exhibited or until people are caught enough in the unjust structures, it is difficult for them and us to realize our power to change negative social structures.

The addition of Field Education in theological schools has made some breakthrough toward educating persons to change structures in the day-to-day life needs, problems and situations of individuals, groups and organizations. Change covers areas from personal questions to the broadest local, state, national and international involvements. For example, what are we doing regarding proper appointments on Commissions of Chaplaincy Services? We need pastoral ministers who know, through supervised experiences, about fair employment practices, equal opportunity employment, underpaid migrant workers, state lobbyists and current political trends. We need pastoral ministers that, in the name of justice, allow the whole Christian community to participate in the discussions that govern them.

As a field supervisor at the Graduate Theological in Berkeley, I deal with two specific problems out in the community:

1. People in the community do have something to tell us, but are silent and, for whatever reason, without our help, will refuse to speak. And, because of that silence, we lose. On the other hand,
2. Our students, for whatever reason, don't always listen in the community and, even though they go out and feel they have done good things, they often have failed to learn. They may get affirmative strokes by doing their own thing but, to me, that tends to limit a person's talents. Where the talent is buried, as the parable tells us, little learning, growing or revelation can take place.

I see pastoral educators as having an invaluable opportunity and contribution to heal those who are alienated in every level and condition of the church and society. However, most often it is difficult for community people and persons living and working with the poor and alienated to overcome the stereotyped patterns they have of "churchy people". They feel, for the most part, that pastoral ministers have a hard time in relating to the "real world".

Often the poor and alienated of the community are overwhelmed by our knowledge and, because of their own limited scope and our method of dealing with them, are insecure with us and fail to realize what they have to offer us as well as receive from us. It seems each one is threatened by the other.

Our goal in ministry, as I see it, is finding out the need and then bringing together the need and the help available. Using the CPE method of supervision in this area can be the new radical impact of CPE. Assessment in this area can be made by listening and inquiring into enough alternatives with sensitivity. Learning how to offer help and learning how to offer my help are not the same. My purpose in field education is to assist a person to offer his/her own unique style of ministry to individual persons, groups of people, or organizations of people in crisis, struggle or need. If this help is not provided, if we as advocates negate our role, the future generations will see our churches filled with affluent status oriented worshippers and with aging men and women; churches that will empty slowly and become echoing caverns of nothingness. "Lord, to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life." (John 6:68)

There are five important areas "close to home" in which we can reach out as advocates. First, we need to involve the neglected laity. Lay persons share in the mission and ministry of the Church through baptism and commitment, not by delegation. If they share in the mission of the Church, should they not have some responsibility for decision making, for direction and for ministry? Practice tells us we will succeed when we utilize the experience and insights of the whole community. If only the minister makes decisions, we run the risk of distortion--receiving only part of the message of the Spirit. We must open opportunities for lay ministry because it is simply impossible to meet demands placed on the institutional and parish needs today without total involvement of the community in determining needs,

setting priorities and identifying resources. For example, how can any parish provide for worship, sacramental preparation, religious education, visiting shut-ins, witness to parish commitment of social justice, care for the divorced and separated, ministering to families, youth and aged, keeping the books, balancing the budget, without help from the wider community? Laity and clergy need to work as a team with and for one another.

Second, another work for us as advocate is to ask our organization if we, as a group, wish talents and gifts to go untapped because we are hung up on having only seminary students and clergy types in CPE. It is my experience that, when trying to get a student in CPE who is without formal theological background, I am blocked by the system or supervisor and usually have to manipulate one or the other, or pad my recommendations so those persons (mostly women who have a great deal of religious background without formal theological training) can have the opportunity to do the kind of ministry they feel called to do in their second careers. We need to recognize non-traditional educational approaches to the ministry. Although theological training is important, nevertheless, when a middle-aged female professional nurse has decided to go into hospital ministry and has a history of service to the Church, I question the rigidity of a system that isn't flexible enough to look at individual circumstances whether or not there is ecclesiastical endorsement.

This situation evidences a lack of self-awareness on the part of the system which may lead to serious blocks. Also, unfortunately, we live in a strange world. It can be risky business in ministry if we judge only by the size of the diplomas or the number of courses, rather than by the size of the heart and intimacy with the Lord.

Yet a third question we as advocates might have is, "How competent is an organization which neglects to have a procedure for recognizing supervisory competence of other professions by providing varied standards when those with comparable professional training request supervisory status in ACPE?"

A fourth question we as advocates might wish to ask is, "Why are there no formalized standards and procedures for reviewing supervisory development as there are for student development?" Growth in self-awareness should not be confined to the professional training of students. It is an inherent part of the professional growth of the minister and it is a process that never ends. A supervisor who can freely share with his/her students his own attempts to expand clinical self-awareness and justice awareness models, rather than merely instruct his/her student in this essential skill.

And finally, because of the knowledge and skill of supervisors, is there not a great need in theological schools to develop supervisors for Field Education Departments? With such a partnership, more needed dialogue might take place toward integrating theological and spiritual understanding with knowledge of behavioral science. Vernon Strempts and I initiated an exciting pilot program for eight sessions at the GTU on Supervision as Ministry. It was so well received that this Fall, it will be part of the GTU curriculum.

Len and I were talking about not only the liaison with Field Education Departments of theological schools, but also about developing liaisons with religious organizations of brothers, priests and sisters who have had few

Address by Sister Chris Bennett

opportunities to develop through intense supervised learning. It is my belief that exposure to CPE would be invaluable. Perhaps this could be done in mini-seminars and courses much like Roy Futscher, Joe Wadowicz, Rod Seeger, Wendell Stangeland and others are presently offering.

With the foregoing points in mind, I appeal to you today for broadened involvement. I appeal to you to make Christ the believable one within your own community, institutions, parishes, families--often against overwhelming odds. I appeal to you to continue to struggle as advocate in your healing ministry--that together we can build more socially aware churches and CPE organizations which will provide not only for great heroes but also for heroines.

I don't believe there is a retirement age in the mystical body of Christ--no pensioning of members. I believe as long as we have breath within, especially as religious, we do have a commitment and a capacity to be a free force, an honest mirror and a leaven within our own community and also the larger community.

There are varying means to increase our corporate thrust toward broadened involvement, and one important way is to enrich and respond to our individual selves. It is only in developing our own human potential that we can truly give authentic response and witness to the Living Word. Since this is done only through interaction and freedom, it is inevitable that the ministry of the eighties will be continually discovering new ways of relating with God, with self and with others. But let's not wait for the eighties. The day is today. The opportunity is now to serve the present age with personal and political power.

CERTIFICATION VERSUS FREEDOM FOR MINISTRY

Address by Richard John Neuhaus
Lutheran Pastor New York City
October 20, 1979 - Twelfth Annual Conference
Association for Clinical Pastoral Education - Washington, DC

Certification versus freedom for ministry: that involves a great deal. It obviously involves a whole bundle of assumptions about the nature of ministry; about the nature of professionalization in our kind of world. I'll be trying to touch a good many of these bases, and you'll probably wonder whether perhaps I'm trying to touch too many, as I myself perennially wonder halfway through most of my presentations. It's a little like a book that was written by a fellow named George Abbott who is famous for not much of anything. He was Archbishop of Canterbury for a very brief period of time in the seventeenth century, but is mainly noted for having written a little book. I am told it is a very, very little book. I have never read it, but it has had an enormous influence on me just by virtue of the title. The title of this extraordinary thin little volume is A Brief Description of the Whole World. By the end of this talk, you may wonder in your mind whether I am trying to update the last two hundred years of George Abbott's rather ambitious enterprise.

CPE, and I want to lift up the P, the pastoral, for it seems to me that without that, there is an inevitable vacuity, and an inevitable shallowness about the whole effort to engage Christian ministry in an enterprise of a therapeutic nature, the definitions of which are primarily derived from sources that are not sympathetic to and often quite explicitly hostile to Christian truth claims. Being much more directly involved, you can readily appreciate the different assumptions about human nature, about the nature of history, about the purpose and the meaning of existence, that are involved in trying to put together the pastoral, deriving from the history and concerns and assumptions of the church, on the one hand and, what is, for all practical purposes, still a relatively novel enterprise, the notion of professional psychotherapy in one form or another, on the other. It seems to me that it is from your identity as ministers of the church that one can derive the force for a long-term, sustained commitment to what is commonly called a "helping profession".

Finally the question is, "Why help?"--if there is not any really transcendent reason, and if there is not some motor force that goes beyond the satisfactions of seeing a problem resolved or seeing someone who was not able to cope now able to cope, or someone who was on the edge of some kind of abyss of personal despair and disintegration being able to put their lives together. For those experiences you do not have day by day. That cannot keep you going, that experience of success in doing those things. I suspect that is as true of all pastoral care, including care along the more professionalized lines that many of you are engaged in. The criteria of success, the criteria of demonstrated utility with regard to a clear linkage between your efforts and what is achieved, are to say the least fragile. They are not enough to sustain a long-term commitment.

Christian ministry, it seems to me, is by definition a radical commitment. And the task of effective Christian ministry is to be engaged as a long-distance radical, if you will; not going from one high to another, from one sense of accomplishment-achievement to another, desperately waiting for the next little "up" that will be able to help you coast through a few more days of "downs"; but rather a sense that there is a mystery in which we are involved. Ministry and mystery go closer together, and that mystery I would assume, but perhaps we should not assume, has to be made explicit again and again. We have to make it explicit to ourselves day by day that mystery is incorporated and articulated most centrally for us, absolutely for us, in the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. This is the transcendent dimension. Very often it is the case, whether one be working in a psychotherapeutic area or whether, as many others are, working in the area of social change and the quest for justice through the political process, that one tends to set the immanent against the transcendent: the mundane, itchy, sweaty, smelly, unsatisfactory business of trying to respond to human need, and on the other hand, all of the rhetoric which so often seems esoterically removed from that mundane business, all of the rhetoric of theology if you will. One world is the world of the transcendent, the other the world of the immanent; and it seems to me that we all fall into this no matter what our several "specializations" or quirks or eccentricities are within the ministries of the church. We all need, day by day, to be called back to the radical proposition that these two are one and that indeed the transcendent, the absolute future whom we call God, is man in this humanity of which we are a part in all of its particularity and all of its unsatisfactoriness and all of that which to the rational person must lead to despair. That is the case if we are only rational, as the modern world understands rationality in all of its truncated, feted, secular limitation which excludes the sense of mystery, of the transcendent.

A few years ago in New York City, but perhaps outside of New York City, I do not know, the Urban League distributed buttons that said, "Give a damn," and people wore these buttons, and it was a good thing. It meant, however inelegantly expressed, a noble sentiment. It said, "Give a damn about the city; give a damn about the poor; give a damn about racial justice; give a damn about a whole host of things that need committed long-distance radical concern." But the obvious question, whether one is concerned as I have been over the years in terms of urban change and in terms of black-white relations and the approximations of justice for which we so feebly and inadequately reach, or whether one is concerned for the healing of persons whose lives are so untogether that they do not know who they are or what they might be, is, "Why give a damn?" Why, really?

It seems to me that here ministry and mystery, the transcendent truths alone, can give a satisfactory answer. There is no persuasive reason to give a damn especially about the marginal, and about the vulnerable, and about the useless in society unless we sense some kind of transcendent bond that calls us to obligation. Why should one give a damn about the three million Cambodians who are literally at this moment starving to death, about the hundreds of thousands of children there who are so weak that they cannot even cry--not even a final cry of protest before they have their lives cut short? Why give a damn? There are many, many rational people, well-educated people, thoughtful people--people, presumably in the

avant garde of what the modern world is about, who would tell us that not only should we not give a damn, but that it is a very good thing, as brutal as it sounds, that the world's population be reduced. For don't you know that we are already overburdening the limited resources of this very, very closed little spaceship, earth? And so the Garritt Hardins and the Paul Erlichs of America would tell us that we ought not to give a damn about those Cambodians; we ought not to give a damn about the 12-year-old girl starving to death in the northeast jungles of Brazil; and a host of others all around the world. Nor should you give a damn about many of the people who day by day are working so hard to help. There are a great many in our culture who are engaged in the explicit program of reversing the Christian ethic. They seek to reverse the whole Judaeo-Christian notion that life in its fullness is to be discovered in service. And they would impose upon us a rather different kind of ethic, an ethic that presumably is aimed at preserving the excellencies of those who are the achievers, those who are the doers, those who are the successes.

The caring dimension, it seems to me, is rooted in a mystery of acknowledging that every other sister and brother is in fact precisely that. That it is not poetry, but a hard statement of the way the universe is constructed, that in some sense their death, their weakness, their wounding diminishes us. It is not sentimentality, but a very hard-nosed statement of the most elementary thing we understand about the nature of history that each one of us will indeed be called in the final judgment to give account for all those, our brothers and sisters, for whom we care. This derives from a sense of ministry, from a sense of the richness of the church's tradition; and, it seems to me that any other way of approaching the meeting of human needs, again whether it be through psychotherapeutic professionalism, or whether it be through other kinds of activity, finally has to wear thin, cannot sustain, cannot bear the disappointments, the moments of utter uncompromising honesty which can lead us to despair of the enterprises of caring in which we are engaged. This is to say that theology and theology of ministry are at the heart of what we are doing. It is a distressing thing to me, as I hope it is to you, that many people do not see in pastoral care, and those involved in pastoral care, the emphasis upon theology in seminary education and in the continuing education of clergy. They do not see much theology. It seems to many that pastoral theology is to theology as military music is to music. Why is it? Why is it that the reflection upon the Christian truth claims about the nature of this human animal, yet a little less than the angels, perhaps even sons and daughters of God, seems to be so short-changed? It has not always been the case.

Great theology has frequently emerged in the history of two thousand years of the Christian church precisely from that point in the church where there was the greatest intensity of pastoral care. Certainly, during the patristic period in the early centuries of the church, the great theologians were pastors; the great theologians were counselors and confessors and spiritual directors. There was a relationship between the most rigorous theological reflection and, if you will, the praxis of pastoral care. That is not true today. It was true not only in the patristic era; it was true in the early period of this country. In Protestant history, in the Puritan period, the theologians were the pastors. Today, that is very,

very much the exception, as I am sure is not the fault simply of people moving in particular specialized directions of pastoral care such as CPE. It is also the fault of the so-called professional theologians. There is a theological failure in the common notion that ministry should reconcile us to our sins rather than reconcile us to our savior. What are the implications of that for psychotherapy of whatever sort? Why is it, I ask you, not in a condemnatory way, believe me, not in a judgmental way, but in a pleading way that we might together search for the answer; why is it, at least in my experience, and I know in the experience of many others, that the hard theological questions have not been asked in the context of CPE and, in general, in the context of so-called pastoral theology? Why is it that here, as in so many other areas where you have theology and something or the other--theology and psychology, theology and the arts, theology and politics, theology and whatever--the second field usually provides the basic assumptions for the discussion? It is the theological statement which is accommodated and often reduced in order to fit in with the cognitive world of another discipline that often emerges in explicit hostility to the Christian truth claims.

Reconciliation is not to our sin, but to the destiny to which we are called, which is anything but a quiet, tranquil, well-adjusted kind of reconciliation. Our call is to intensify the restlessness; not to calm the fears, but to illuminate the real reasons for fear; not to say I'm okay and you're okay, but to acknowledge the horror and to believe that in entering into the horror, there is at the heart of it--at the bottom of the abyss--salvation; for there is the Christ. "Fear not; it is my father's good pleasure to give unto you the kingdom." He says this to us communally, and he says this to us individually. Thus, it is not reconciliation to the way things are, but the intensifying of restlessness and the transformation of lives. Our lives are transformed, not adjusted. The way things are is clearly contrary to the rule of God, which is the core of Christian commitment and Christian belief that the meaning of history is the effecting in history and over history and through all things the power who is God revealed in Jesus Christ. Clearly, that is not where we are now. Things are not okay now. Health is to argue against the way things are. Every prayer is a protest. Your kingdom come is to protest all that is resisting, within ourselves and outside ourselves, the coming of His kingdom. To link our ministries again to the mystery means that we overcome in every area of ministry the false dichotomy that people have made, as I said earlier, between transcendence and immanence, a false, wicked dichotomy; and, also, the dichotomy between piety and protest, between prayer and politics. These are not different things. The more deeply we enter in the heart of the mystery, the more our lives are shaped by the spirit-formed piety of devotion, the more radically are we committed to the worldly tasks, the more radically and the more clearly do we perceive the presence of the Christ calling us in each other, making each other 'significant others', ultimately 'significant others'. "Behold, you are a new creation; the old has passed away; the new has come." (II Corinthians V)

How do we make our ministries, whether they be in the area of social change or in the area of healing those who are presumably mentally ill (and aren't we all?), transforming? As the people begin to see not the

possibilities of getting along with the way things are, but begin to see the power of living a life toward what is to be (and so, by living a life toward what is to be, walking by faith and not by sight, actually effecting, actualizing in this present moment that future, which is to say the presence and power of God; not to alleviate suffering, but to turn suffering into a sharing of the cross of Christ with joy, knowing that we do it not in a morbid fascination with the garbage dump of Golgotha from which the world's redemption was raised, but rather that we do it in the light of the resurrection by which the cross alone was vindicated and has meaning), transformation becomes possible.

People are alienated; that is good. Can we ask fundamental questions like that? Is it not a sign of health--alienation? We are told that is a great disease, and it is blamed on capitalism or the social structure, all kinds of cultural patterns, or whatever. We are alienated, and we are supposed to be alienated. We are strangers and foreigners. How can we sing the songs of Zion in a foreign land? We are in a foreign land, and here we sing the songs of Zion only in hope, describing things not the way they are, but describing things as they will be. And it is the transforming power of that hope to which we as Christian ministers are to be calling people again and again.

The Christian community is the place where people can dare to hope. Remember Kurt, the anti-hero in Joseph Conrad's The Heart of Darkness? Kurt is this fellow who has spent all these years observing the terror, and the brutality, and the inhumanity of nineteenth century slave trade in central Africa. We have Kurt, finally dying. As his eyes close, he says simply, "The horror! The horror!" We have seen the horror, God willing, for we have been to the cross. To be healed is to have passed through the horror, not to have skirted it, not to have escaped it; but to have believed most radically that it is in the loss that there is the found, and to be lost is to be found. What does this mean in terms of the orthodoxes, of theory and praxis, in psychotherapy? What does it mean that the whole of the Christian message is calling us to live courageously, which means to live in a world where we rely upon the grace of loving, where most of our needs go unsatisfied, where we repudiate the pagan notion that it is possible to live authentic existence now in tune with oneself, one's feelings, one's psyche, one's needs? It is not possible, and we should not tell lies to people. It is not healing when we've persuaded them of our lies.

We are living far short of the consummation of the kingdom of God. We call people to faith and to courage and to face the Horror. As Abraham Joshua Heschel, that great Jewish theologian, so eloquently said again and again, "God calls us to join him in his pathos." It is not the successfully coping person, but in the precise sense of the work, in the pathetic person, that we find the way to healing. God is in trouble with his creation. The shape of history is still cross-shaped, cruciform; and the great freedom and the great joy of Christians is that we are not paralyzed by that. We are not thrown into despair, for we believe that we have already passed from death to life in Jesus Christ, in the enactment of that in our baptism, in the day-by-day reunion with Him who is not simply life in the abstract, but most particularly our life and the life of all who live.

To enter into the pathos then, this is the meaning of life. To find ways of turning our professional expertise, whatever that may be, in a way that helps to sustain people in walking through the valley of the shadow and not to provide them with shortcuts or byways around it. To help people to understand that the goal is not autonomy, the autonomous person, the goal of health is not independence, but an ever more radical dependence upon Him who is life. And what might all this mean more specifically?

In recent years, Peter Berger, the sociologist, and I have been co-directors of what we call a mediating structures project, which is an effort to look at the public policy in the United States and to ask in what way can public policies be changed so as not to undercut and weaken, but rather to strengthen and lift up what we call the mediating structures, which are the people-sized institutions which people themselves elect--the family, the church, the voluntary association, various racial and ethnic subgroupings with which people choose to identify. How does one in public policy strengthen and protect these institutions against the mega-structures of society--big government, big labor, and the big corporations?

There is a component of the mediating structures project which is very much a part of what I think we need to talk about in this context, and that is the idea of professionalization in our world. In what sense are we professionals and in what sense do we want to be professionals? The word professional, of course, has an absolutely charming and elegant and winsome history, having to do with professing, having to do with standing up, as it were, in representation of a reality, a truth, greater than oneself. But you and I know that in the ministry today, in so many different fields (not only in CPE by any means) there is this lust for professional status which has nothing to do with that noble, winsome grandeur of a history. It has to do precisely with status. In some cases, let us be quite candid about it, it has to do with money, and most of all with inner security about who we are. It is at that last point that it is most seductive, and its damage most lethal.

How do we change professionalism so that it is genuine and ancillary, and not oppressive; so that it actually enables people, individuals, and individuals in their communities to do better what they themselves, in ninety-nine percent of the cases, know needs doing, rather than imposing our expertise upon their lives? There's an enormous task, and it runs counter to (one has to be quite blunt about this) an enormous number of vested interests, for there are vested interests galore in the expansion of every form of professionalization. We see people reaching for that status as professionals. An enormous number of people need to be employed, and they are employed in that way. There are a lot more who are going to need to be employed, and so what do we have to do? We have to discover more and more "needs". We have to discover needs and persuade people that indeed they have needs which they are not capable of dealing with and for which we and our cohorts have the expertise. As we multiply needs, so we multiply the job opportunities, so we multiply our own more open-ended career advancement. It is a wicked process. And we are all engaged in it.

It used to be said frequently of the church that the church was in the business of guilt and had to go around making people feel guilty so that they would come and get salvation and forgiveness and absolution, etc., which was the church's specialty. There is a good deal of truth in that except now we have a further irony in that (Is it not true among many of us?) we now persuade people that they dare not have any feelings of guilt, and so we have another specialized ministry which will relieve them of their feelings of guilt.

It is very interesting the way these things work historically, one thing winding into another; but they are both wrong. If we care about the mystery, are we prepared to go back to our colleagues in the ministry (those who are not specialists, so to speak, in pastoral care, in clinical care, in psychotherapeutic processes of various sorts) and embolden them to be unapologetic witnesses to the grandeur and the madness and the scandal of the Christian vision? Are we going back to really sustain them in the grandeur of their ministries; or, to make them feel that in some sense they are dependent upon the more narrowing, ever more focused specializations in which we have an interest?

They need to be sustained. They need to be renewed. They need to recover nerve for the grandeur of that ministry, so that when one is acting as pastor, a parishioner who comes to him and says that he talked with angels last night is not suspect. But is it not true that in many of our churches today, the parishioner who denies the very possibility of talking with angels is considered a healthier specimen when, in fact, that parishioner has simply succumbed to the truncated, secular, closed little cognitive world of a pagan culture? We live in a universe in which we breathe the air along with angels and archangels, and our task is to open up the mystery and excitement, to let it run daringly in our own lives and in the lives of other people while lovingly holding their hands, if you will. We may appear to some to be at least neurotic if not psychotic; but we are all engaged in only one thing, and that is the pursuit of the truth that we know intuitively, that we have perceived in small part in our Lord Jesus Christ who is the truth. ACPE: let it never be the Association for the Clinical Prevention of Eccentricity. Make the world larger, not smaller. Give people the courage to act upon the radical content of the Christian proposition.

Dimitri Dudko is a Russian Orthodox priest, a bold and eloquent man, recently silenced by the Soviet regime. He has written a marvelous little book which I'd warmly recommend to you, from St. Vladimir's Press, called Our Hope. It is based on Saturday night sessions where people were free to ask questions. It was considered a very subversive and dangerous thing, of course, by the regime there. One person asked, "Father Dudko, what is a confessor?" And Dudko answered, "Your confessor is someone who worries about your salvation." In all your ministries, worry above all about their salvation.

Thank you.

FIRST RESPONDENT: Bill Arnold

Richard, as I listened to your remarks, I couldn't help but be reminded of one of the classical distinctions that's made between Presbyterians and Lutherans. If Martin Luther and John Calvin had had the occasion to be at the foot of the cross together, Martin would have been dancing around the cross screaming, "Thank you, Lord. I'm saved, I'm saved!" and John Calvin would say, "Shut up, Martin! I'm trying to think of what the implications of all this are." I guess that is the position that I find myself in here as I have listened to what you have said. The proclamation that you have given is an important one. I think some legitimate word could be raised to us in CPE about the kind of theological integrity that we have exercised at points. There certainly are those of us who, when we ask for a theological evaluation at the end of a verbatim, really want people to free associate about how many Bible verses they can think of, and it often doesn't move beyond that. Yet, we struggle to try to take that more seriously, I hope, in recent years.

We have had to struggle with the whole issue of authority, but all too often we have struggled with authority in terms of our own sense of authority. We have not always struggled until recently with to whom we are accountable. In other words, what is that authority outside of ourselves to whom we declare our fidelity? It is the old question of those who try to evaluate why they care and for what reason do they do it. There are those who would say they will care for someone because it is so clear that they do feel good themselves after having exercised care. There are others who say, "I can see so many good things happen for the other person for whom I care that that makes it worthwhile for me to do it." But all too often we have avoided that third category of when we don't feel much better about it. We can't tell a great deal that seems to come out good for the person for whom we care, and that creates that third category for whom we can only care for Jesus' sake because it is so miserable otherwise to engage in that process. We need to look at that whole area of authority and accountability about sacrament as you discussed it in your book. What is it and for what ministry have we pledged ourselves as a group who are committed to the sacrament--the sense of community of which we are a part?

While your proclamation is one that is important for us to consider as we wrestle with those issues, I think there are some others that are worth looking at as well. For instance, one of the sources in CPE for me that has been very important is the view that suffering is not something to be avoided. Rather, it is something that I have constantly been invited to participate in. Now, very often, I think, the rationale for that and the basis for it has been intuitive or, when it is stated, it has been stated more in existentialist terms than in theological terms. Nonetheless, I think there is a distinction because of the focus that CPE has placed on the personal process--the importance of personal growth rather than simply learning technique in order to help people feel better or to do better in their living. That is an important component which to me has good theological roots which perhaps have been more intuitive with us than articulated, and it calls each one of us to articulate that more effectively theologically.

Getting back down to the Calvinistic-Lutheran difference, which may or may not be adequate, there is a question I would like to ask: "How do we view the whole process of certification and legitimation?" I think we always run the risk of the diplomas and the certificates on the walls somehow defining what our ministry is about. I hope that instead of that, the diplomas and the credentials and the certification processes should reveal the seriousness by which we seek to carry out our sense of calling. We always run the risk of falling on either side of that, and I think that the tension is important. But to me the legitimation process, the certification process, has a real place in our seeking to try to live out some kind of accountability and responsibility to one another in ministry. It goes back to the old phrase of what does it mean to be in subjection to the brothers and the sisters? It is a way in which we try to live out a kind of accountability which we may proclaim to God, but all too often it is easy to slip into a privatistic notion and say, "I am only accountable to God," and thus avoid subjecting myself to other kinds of accountability in how we live out that call. Is our calling one that is simply in a vertical dimension or do we also claim the kind of call that means we examine ourselves in a peer process, in a contemporary process for theological reasons, not simply psychological reasons? That is a very important piece of what I think certification and legitimation is about. There's always the danger of slipping into adopting the standards of the culture. We've run that risk and slipped many times, and for Presbyterians to talk about backsliding is a unique event in itself! At the same time I think we need to examine the "rightness" of legitimation-certification as a way of seeking to live out our call more seriously and responsibly in taking that into account. I am not sure whether that was an implication of what you were saying or not, but I would like to hear you respond to that.

Neuhaus Responds to Bill Arnold

Very briefly, I think it is very useful to have the question of accountability raised. Perhaps you will agree that a good many people who have specialized, as you all have, have done so in a way that is designed, that was intended in their own minds, to remove themselves from what was considered the rather onerous structures of the churches. In some ways, it was a way out from the churches or at least from the conventional ministries as the churches had designed them. And God knows, they are oppressive enough in many cases. At the same time one sees the kind of crunch of identity in the desire to maintain some level of accountability with the churches. For the bishops and the superintendents and the presidents, etc., of the several judicatories, that is often, as you know, just a bureaucratic question: "How do you relate to the decisions of the judicatory, to the pension plans, and to all the other paraphernalia of ecclesial association?" The much more important question of accountability, it seems to me, that doesn't disturb as many people in the churches as it ought to, is: where is the ideational, if you will, accountability? Where, in terms of Christian method, is the theological accountability? At what point is one really critically engaging the church's conventional wisdom and piety to be sure, but also the conventional wisdom and piety, if you will, of the quasi-religious assumptions of a therapeutic society, to use Phillip Rief's term. Accountability, I think, cuts more to the core when you get to the ideational level rather than just how are we as people engaging in this profession engaged with the institutionalization of the church.

What you said about the focus on the personal is very, very important. Now most of the time I write and speak in relation to the church's interaction with culture and with social and political change, but also in regard to the psychotherapeutic. The church should make no apology for its focus on the personal. There are a good many people who are inclined to say, "Well, that's the privatizing of religion," and so forth and so on. Not so, I think, if one understands with some theological profundity what is meant by the person, and here I am much heartened and encouraged; indeed, I have to restrain myself from being ecstatic over the witness of John Paul II who's whole very impressive witness, theologically and in terms of his pastoral leadership, is this lifting up of the person. But he lifts up the person in a way that holds the person very closely to community, and also holds the community accountable to the person. I am reminded, and I have to constantly remind my friends in social and political struggles, of Dr. Johnson's marvelous statement, "Of all the pains that human hearts endure, how small a part that laws and kings can cause or cure." It is a very profound insight. I think that is where your witness, to the extent that you aggressively and critically engage the church, can revive theologically in the churches a personalistic, in the best sense of the word, orientation that would be a valuable corrective to all of our sisters and brothers in different ministries who have subscribed to the notion that what laws and kings can do, namely, the process of social and political change, is what is totally normative for the church. In that sense I think your witness should be much more actively engaged.

Finally, with regard to the diplomas, etc., that's a bit of hyperbole. I do not insist that you take them off the wall. Obviously, you have to be all things to all people. Ministry requires engaging people where they are and all those other cliches. People do live in a culture in which credentialing is very, very important. To the degree that diplomas on your wall invite confidence, perhaps they are necessary in some kind of initial way in order to begin a conversation or an exchange within an atmosphere of trust and confidence. But you have to ask yourself, I think, whether the diplomas are there to invite confidence or whether they are there to intimidate; whether they are there to say, "I am someone whom you can trust who has worked through this kind of problem before," or whether they are there to say, "I am the expert in this problem, and I will guide you or lead you," or if one is less non-direct, "tell you." The important thing is that you don't wear the diplomas on the walls of your mind; that's much more important in terms of who you are. The diplomas do not belong there. There must be the cross alone; there the Christian hope alone.

Bill Arnold:

That's helpful. The one thing that I would want to add on the diploma issue is to emphasize accountability again. To me it becomes one means by which persons can see to it that they continue to engage themselves in some kind of growth. By growth, I am thinking in terms of theological responsibility in a way that does not allow one to move off into a privatistic notion which I think would be negative, simply being able to live off of a personal sense of doing what one wishes without having to engage in some kind of continued conversation and dialogue with others which will stimulate that kind of growth.

Richard Neuhaus:

Right. And yet, there is in a sense a very personal thing, isn't there, in Christian spiritual guidance, counseling, pastoral care, the cure of souls, whatever we call it which is that quality of holiness which no institution that I am aware of is competent to issue certificates and certifications on. And is this person someone who himself or herself has been through the valley and lives in the intimacy in relation to the absolute which can qualify that person, if you will, to give confidence to me? This person can be a director, a guide, and partner, a whatever in my own quest for holiness.

Bill Arnold:

Richard, I hear you sort of being an idealist, in a sense, with a cause behind it that I can agree with. I am wondering if you are trying to say that if credentials and status are there as a substitute for something of ultimate substance, then we are really in bad trouble. Is that a qualitative thing you are talking about rather than an absolute or either/or about credentials? Is it a question of by what right do I really exist and have a right to be here in this place, the ultimate and the penultimate? Is that what you are talking about?

Richard Neuhaus:

In part it is a question of degree, perhaps, but it is more importantly a question of intention. What does one intend? Obviously, there are competencies in terms of pastoral care. There's no question about that. And there are things to be learned which ought not to be dismissed as mere technique. A technique is not mere. It is very important to be able to do certain things, and there are certain predictable patterns, obviously, in the way in which people enter into conversation, expose themselves, make themselves vulnerable in terms of their problems, and so forth, and the mechanics of that should be learned.

So, it is a question of intention. Are these things instrumental to (to put it in its most absolute terms which I'd say is not idealistic, but rather elementary to Christian existence) union with God? Or, in Dudko's term "salvation"? Or is the basic intention some kind of empirically verifiable resolution of a problem? In one's ministry, is one more aware of problems that are to be resolved or mysteries that are to be entered into, which is ultimately the mystery of Christ and the promise of God in Jesus Christ?

SECOND RESPONDENT: Cameron Byrd

I find myself hard pressed to really disagree with Richard on what he had to say, and Bill really lifted up a lot of the things that I had on my mind. One thing that I do appreciate about Richard is that he has been informed by Black religious thought, and lifts up in his book the ministry of the Word. I think that oftentimes in CPE that aspect of the Word is neglected and is really something that we need to recover, because folks, even when they are hurting, don't want to know what our credentials are, but want

to know if there is any word from the Lord. I think our task in this whole business is to become so transparent that folks will know with some urgency that there is a word from the Lord.

I want to also thank you for really setting us aright again in terms of the whole issue of credentialing. I wanted to ask you to talk about credentialing and freedom, and I guess you have touched on that and said more about that because I worked hard for my credentials and some of these folks in this room put me through a lot of hoops. I worked very hard, and I was going to take my certificates off the wall when I first read your book; then I decided that I would really keep them on. The problem is that in my church I heard one person say that the reason that I was called to that church was because they wanted to call somebody 'doctor'. I said, "My God, that is awful!" This is Washington, so that is probably just normative here in D. C. But we think that in CPE we are dealing with the pastoral, and that theology has been too cognitive. CPE is not a way out of ministry, but it is a way into ministry. We think that we are providing a corrective to some of the atrocities that may occur in some of the halls of theological learning where, aside from some field education, theological students don't really get the opportunity to work in the nitty-gritty of life. So, we feel that we are really coming up against the suffering; we are coming up against those who are in pain and are hurting. We may sometimes become too privatized, as Bill said about it, and we need to keep our engagement with the wider church; but we think we are working with, as history says, living human documents. We feel that theology has been too cognitive, and I wish you would say something to us as we work with the nitty-gritty, every-day in hospitals or in parishes and talk more about theological reflections with us as we do that kind of work. We feel we are doing theology as people who are working in this field, and so if you could speak to us and minister to us about the role of theological reflection in our work in the every-dayness of it, I would appreciate that.

I appreciate what you had to say and how you said it. I appreciate the fact that you are a good preacher, and I appreciate that in your book you lifted up the importance of our being able to use the Word or to develop the gift to translate the Word for folks in this day and age. So, I do not know if I have given you anything to react to about it. I think we have gone through a period where we did want Caesar's approval of what we are doing, and I think I am seeing in CPE a movement where we are beginning to regain our own sense of identity and authority. It is coming out of our understanding of who we are as pastors and as folk whom the Lord has called; and I think we've been out there, and we're coming back home. Maybe others will disagree with that, but that is my sense.

Neuhaus Responds to Cameron Byrd

Cameron, I appreciate deeply your appreciation of the emphasis upon the Word and the particularity in Freedom for Ministry where I related preaching to what little, I hope, I have learned from the Black experience. Much of my ministry has been among Black folk who, I believe, still constitute the litmus test, if you will, of whether or not the truly worthy and profound, even theological hopes attached to the American experiment will ever be vindicated. That litmus test is still in terms of black-white relations, and the returns by no means are all in.

The emphasis upon the Word--Lutherans, of course, are famous for making sharp distinctions between law and gospel; and I, in the eyes of many of my Lutheran Confirmeres, especially the hyper-orthodox ones, am not nearly as consistent as I ought to be or as emphatic as I ought to be in that distinction. But I think there is a great validity in it. In directing the Word, one of the most useful things one can do, in a sense, is the speaking of the law. Now I realize, of course, that gets into a whole long, hoary history in CPE circles about directive and non-directive and all that, but I think we have to rediscover, in some sense, the Jewish understanding, if you will, that there is a gospel in the giving of the law. The psalmists rejoiced in the law, giving thanks to God that to no other people has He given such a law as this. The law signals, if you will (and here I would refer to the kind of argument developed by my friend, Peter Berger, in his book, Rumor of Angels, which I am sure is familiar to many of you), that this is ultimately a moral universe of which we are a part. That is not to say that what is happening is moral, but it is to say that the ultimate meaning of reality, viewed in retrospect from the end time when God, our faithful God, keeps his promises and the kingdom is come, will be seen as a moral universe. Therefore, there is an enormous good news and dignity in one being able to act as a moral agent. It would seem to me that one of the most exciting things that you could contribute from the various psychological and psychologically associated dimensions of ministry is, a la Carl Menninger, What Ever Happened to Sin?, to call people back to an understanding that there is a joy in knowing that it is possible to violate, as it is possible to enhance, and to live in harmony with the moral order of the universe, to help people to become moral agents.

I love your phrase, the transparent thing, Cameron, that one is transparently this kind of person, you know, who lives in communion with God and has a word from God. I think there that we should for a long time be pondering the utterly remarkable response to John Paul on his recent visit here in the United States. What was it? I would suggest to you that it had something to do with that transparency, and transparency through which holiness, however we put it, character, integrity, authenticity, ultimately an intimacy with the ultimate, an intimacy with God, was so clearly perceived.

On the theological thing, you are quite right; most theologians are taking in other theologians' laundry and they're running through the theological courses basically examining other people's verbalizations, and then trying to put some new twists on it so that their book will come out as something new. That is unfortunate. Whose fault is it? I think it is the fault of the systematic theologians, the creative theologians, the dogmatic theologians, or whatever we call them, to a very, very large extent, because the same dynamics towards specialization, and therefore towards self-protection in one's own little enclave of expertise is there. I think that you people who, as you say, are engaged in the very hard, itchy, smelly business of ministry should be calling the seminaries to account and calling the theologians to account.

Let's face it, pastoral theology is viewed as second rate, as not really theology. That has a kind of self-fulfilling prophesy to it. Obviously, if people who are going to counsel students who are going to concentrate in

pastoral care feel that in some sense they are leaving the discourse of vigorous theological reflection; inevitably, that will be reinforcing. The people whose paths they are following probably felt the same things, so everybody kind of settles in. We can't let ourselves settle into these little spheres that are hermetically sealed off from each other. We have to be calling each other to account.

The most exciting thing, it seems to me, that you people should be doing with yourselves and with everybody else who claims to be doing theology is saying, "Look, we are engaged here, and our question is, 'What's going on here?' What's going on here in history with people and between people, and what does this mean in terms of the Christian gospel and in terms of the Christian truth claims?" You should work that through with the same intellectual rigor that many of the systematic theologians pride themselves on, rightly or wrongly. It is the sad sickness of theology today that everywhere we see this perverted specialization. I refer to this in the book, Freedom for Ministry. We see this run amuck so much especially among the many biblical scholars who pride themselves on their highly refined esoteric expertise with regard to historical critical, literary critical, et cetera, assessments of their methodology.

I am all for the historical approach to scriptural study, but that's not the point. The point is scriptural study means nothing unless it is related to the proclamation and the process of the living out of that word in the life of the community. I was recently lecturing at an Episcopal Seminary, and a New Testament scholar said there that what he really wanted to do with his students was to help them to deal through higher critical methodology with the very words of Jesus himself, the Jesus of Nazareth, rather than the Christ of the Church. My response was that if he is not the Christ of the Church, what difference does it make what Jesus of Nazareth said? I think this is patently true, but it is a very nice kind of expertise to have which, again, can be used to preserve one's own little status and protect it against those who would infringe upon one's turf.

So, the self-protection of the dynamics of professionalization are spread all around. I think we all, from every one of the pieces of the church, have to be challenging each other to engage in rigorous theological reflection about the real life of the church and persons in the church.

Cameron Byrd:

While you were talking, Richard (and this probably has nothing at all to do with what you were talking about, but I am going to say it anyway since I have the microphone), I was thinking about the matter of certification. CPE is really a pretty exclusive operation in terms of it dealing with generally middle-class folk and white middle-class folk. There are only three or four black folks here today, and somehow, if what we have to offer is that vital and important, we are going to have to make this available to the brothers and sisters in the storefronts, those who have not got the M. Div. degree. We are going to have to find a way to screen people in, rather than screen people out, it seems to me, if we are going to talk about CPE as a ministry rather than as a profession. It is kind of classist, and a whole economic and educational criteria leaving out a whole lot of folks who are engaged in ministry and could

probably benefit from some of the skills that we have to offer. I think that we are going to have to look at that. If we are going to talk about peer evaluation, we are going to have to broaden our understanding of who is out here in ministry. This just occurred to me as I looked at this vast audience, and as I looked at how damn hard it is for anybody to get credentials in CPE; how expensive it is, etc.

Richard Neuhaus:

I'm sure you would agree with me, Cameron, that it is not simply a question of taking the present skills associated with CPE and sharing them with others, but, that in the process of broadening, the skills and the presuppositions of the skills would be changed dramatically, too.

THIRD RESPONDENT: Robert L. Myers, III

The first thing that I want to say is that I have never hung my credentials on the wall. I have a little feeling of anxiety about standing here in the sense that, from the way you presented what you had to say, and what you had to say, it's a little bit like being opposed to God, Jesus Christ, and faith, and all of that if you want to say anything on the negative side. Be that as it may, I will try. And I do need to preface what I want to say by saying that a lot of what has already been said I do feel strongly about.

My remarks, more specifically and narrowly, are directed from my feeling as not only a clinical pastoral educator, but also as a pastoral counselor; and I think, frankly, more from the book than from your remarks this morning, but both, a little bit of a feeling that maybe you do not understand us very well. Not that I have strong disagreement with what you had to say, but a feeling that there is more to us than you know. I think that we are not nearly so enamored by psychology and the behavioral sciences as you apparently think we are. We are very involved with it, and people here generally are going to be very serious students of behavioral science, but not in the sense of finding these systems as answers to the problems of the world.

Neither do I think there is any salvation in theological systems or ecclesiastical systems. They have their deep limitations, also. We all come from different theological and ecclesiastical backgrounds here, and my guess is that most are very committed to them and work in them; but, again, they have their limitations.

Theological and psychological systems are attempts to view and order reality as we perceive it, and we need it. Nobody here believes that ACPE, AAPC, or whatever is going to be the final word. Perhaps, neither will the church be the final word, at least that is my opinion or psychology. But these are important ways of thinking, perceiving, and relating. Also, I believe that good theology and good therapy should engage us in a process that leads toward greater freedom for the human being--and not to impose that. Now we do it, unfortunately, and I think that from my perspective that is where we have failed. Because in the therapeutic relationship or in the relationship of a person who is in the midst of some great human crisis, at least as they perceive it, the temptation is for the person to say, "Well, what are the answers?" It is their attempt to make sense out of what is going on, and our temptation is to

provide the answers. Because in the reality of the moment of knowing at some gut level that we really do not have the answers, that we only have fragments of answers, is there the temptation to flee to some system --theological, psychological, or otherwise. I don't know if I am asking you to say anything, but I felt the need to say what I had to say.

Neuhaus Responds to Bob Meyers

Well, I am reassured, Bob. You know this group, and you know the whole CPE and the history of it much better than I, and I certainly have every reason to hope that you're right--that it is not a captive to the cognitive worlds of rather restricted psychotherapeutic or behavioral orthodoxes. Good. I hope that is true. At the same time I would have to say that my limited contact with the world that is in some sense represented in this room, the dimension of Christian ministries represented here, makes me less confident than you suggest I should be, and I just may have run into the wrong people. You know, I am perfectly open to that. I have frequently run into the wrong people in a lot of areas.

I would certainly want to agree with you that there is no salvation in theological systems or ecclesiastical systems, for every theological expression is but a fumbling, stammering response to a reality which by the very virtue of it being absolute, cannot be anything more than simply partially suggested by our theological statements. It is a very limited thing, and the only adequate theology, perhaps, is, as our Eastern Orthodox brothers again say, in apophatic theology or, in the west, the *via negativa*, which is the way of silence before the mystery.

Everything else is profoundly inadequate, but you seemed to me to move a little too quickly from ecclesiastical and theological systems to the truth which is, no matter how inadequately, expressed through theological assertions in the Christian faith, and to move too quickly from ecclesiastical systems to the mystery of the church, the body of Christ, the community that gathers around the promise that where two or three are gathered in His name, there is He in the midst of them.

This may be a terribly unsystematic assertion of the truth, profoundly unsystematic, garbled, etc., but it nonetheless partakes of the truth which is, in a sense, a context for answers sustained by the community. While we do not have the answers in the sense that we are not answer-men or answer-women, and people come and we push the proper button, etc.; certainly, it seems to me that any ministry that claims to be Christian does in the course of the relationship with another make clear the context, the points of reference within which what we believe to be the truth is suggested: sin, rebellion, redemption, God, the meaningfulness of history, the vindication of suffering, the call to discipleship, the absolute character of love which is always the breaking in of the kingdom. These points of reference, it seems to me, must

be there. Now are they the answer? Yes, in some sense, they are the answer. Are they broken down in any kind of neat, packageable way to be answers to every possible question that can be asked? No. But they provide the communal and ideational world within which we help others to be fulfilled pilgrims, which is the meaning of freedom. I don't think we can take any other meaning of freedom as being normative for us if we claim our ministries are Christian.

FOURTH RESPONDENT: Peggy Way

Richard, I speak to angels. And they speak to me. I confess it before this group. I also forgive popes. I also read Urban T. Holmes who has finally convinced me that I have always been right about Episcopalians. He says they are filled with creative pathology. I also have been reading some old Rheinhold Niehbur, and he has a marvelous sermon where he says, "The question is whether we are fools for Christ or simply damned fools." That's the context in which I want to respond. I generally agreed with what Richard was saying although I thought he said the right things in the wrong ways. From one point of view, as neither a formal CPE person, although a lover of you and your history, and not a Lutheran theologian, I can be like a double outsider at this point. I want to begin with some comments about who we are--and I am going to use the word 'we', including me as a CPE person because of my original roots with you in the hospital in Chicago and Carl Wennerstrom and Carl Nighswonger and all of those gorgeous years.

First, I want to say three things about who I think we are:

1. I think we are a people filled with nostalgia, a sense of that early call, a sense of religious experience that somehow got us into this originally. And that for many of us, some of that nostalgia became socialized away; and for many of us, we became highly secular people. But I speak to the nostalgia that's there because I understand that we are a group of people ready for the second naivete, as Paul Ricoeur would put it. You know, ready to confess both to our nostalgia and to our longing for the reality of God and to speak out of that in our lives; but not to do it simply because we've been around too long; so I view us like that.
2. I also view us as basically marginal people. For me, one of the only ways I can understand CPE is to understand that it has been trying to be a vocation in somebody else's institution. When you try to be a vocation in somebody else's institution, it affects who you are. When you try to be a vocation in somebody else's institution and aren't clear about your own home institution, in a sense, you are marginal people. And I understand that marginal people are those to whom we need to speak these days about the nature of God; about the nature of the human. I understand that to be an "and" discipline, which you have been, is the most difficult thing in the world. And, generally, "and" disciplines (my own is called religion and personality) don't produce much creative, much constructive effort, and I want to call us past that test.

3. The third thing about us is I understand that we are basically empiricists who have to always deal with that particular human being. We are never allowed the luxury of universal human anguish because we are going to get stuck with a particular person where it is being worked out.

Now I think those three things are part of our genius, and I want to respond to Richard out of those. I believe that those three things have kept us from valuing ourselves, and I don't believe that what can happen from us as a CPE people can happen unless we have a new valuation of ourselves; that our nostalgia, our marginality, and our concern of the particular becomes seen as gifts for which the contemporary, theological world is hungry. End of first comment, so I am speaking to us as that kind of person.

Second, I want to issue an invitation to you to be initiators and intellectuals. There's this great book of Esther in the Old Testament which you might read. It's marvelous for both women and men to read. There's a great quote in there where Esther is called to act "at a time such as this." And I am going to say a few things about "a time such as this." I think that we CPE people have to get over being too damnably imitative, disvaluing of ourselves, critical and negotiating in order to be crazy, and have to initiate and take some rigorous actions to be intellectuals. I have two things to say.

First, I think we need to take a hard look at the fact that our cultural base is eroding. By that I mean that our cultural base of therapy and psychology is no longer being subjected to hugh intellectual critique and is eroding. And that, I think, cannot be our identity.

Secondly, (this is the good news) praxis is winning. See what the theologians did? They changed the name from practice to praxis to make it respectable. So, when you couldn't talk about practice as respectable, now you can talk about praxis; and it is respectable, and we have won. Hurrah! But where are we at the time of winning? That is what I want to address to you because this is the period of history when there is a call for the hermeneutics of pastoral ministry. All hermeneutics means, by the way, is just interpretation, and where you fit as pastoral people. (See, I have to be triple language here to go back and forth in the different ways.) The hermeneutics of pastoral ministry would be to do the theological task at those intersections of history in the middle of concrete history where the tradition, the momentary encounter in the pastoral act, and a variety of analytics come together.

That's what I believe your genius to be, but your literature doesn't show that. See, I think you are hard pressed to show your theological commitments from reading your literature. Now your intention may be there, but what I want to urge you toward is to show now, in a creative literature, three things I have named that I think you should do. That means me as well, because I would like to call you forth to join me in this task.

The first thing you have an awful lot to say about is the nature of authority. The nature of authority is a cultural and a theological issue. What you have to say about it is a move from authoritarianism to autonomy and then a further move to that which is authoritative. Hear that? Now that's a theological move. That's what Richard's talking about. What we do is that we try to free people from authoritarianism and from an authority that has shaped them without their participation. We try to move them to autonomy. We have not yet been responsible to understand the nature of that which is authoritative then for the person who is autonomous. That is a theological issue, and intellectual issue, and you have something to say about this.

The second big one you have something to say about is what it means to live in the middle of history. In my romantic way of putting it: this side of the promised land. The kind of historical, concrete situations you win have few illusions about perfection in human history. We are a world struggling for what it means to live this side of the promised land in grace and in dignity as Black folk have had to learn to live; as women who are crazy have had to learn to live. How do we survive, not cynically, but with grace and dignity this side of the promised land? If you hear that question, that's an intellectual question of the nature of historical existence. You sit right at those questions every moment, dealing with them. I always end up quoting that marvelous passage where, you remember, Moses gets over there, and God says, "There it is, Moses. You can look at it, but you can't go over there." And shortly after that it says, "And Moses lived to be one hundred and twenty, his vigor undiminished and his eye undimmed." I think you people have something to say about living this side of the promised land with your vigor undiminished and your eye undimmed.

The third thing I think you have something to say about intellectually is the nature of moral guidance. See, we live in a period of history when the old way of moral casuistry is left behind. We don't want a new moral casuistry, nor do we want whatever you feel like is right, or that the growth of the self will create its own moral structure. You people, God knows, should have something to say, to help us deal with this issue of moral guidance. How are we to stand living in this world? How do you stand your own vocation without going crazy? How do you avoid burn-out? Those are your problems; it's not that I'm giving them to you. They emerge from your experience if you value yourselves and take yourselves seriously.

Last comment. I am paying my own way to be here with you, by the way. I just want you to know that because I wanted to say these things to you because where I sit on a theological faculty, I need you desperately. I have jotted down the three key ways where I need you desperately. Symbolically, I need you nationally. If there are any of you in Nashville, I really need you there in the empirical sense.

The first place that I need you is that I need you to work with me in moving from a therapeutic to an ecclesial model that is formulated in the parish. I do not need you to take your CPE model (which I have said publicly for ten years, is the best one there is, okay?) into the parish and apply it there. I need for you to come without your model, but with your competence and your commitment and sit with me and people like me to formulate how to educate people for generic ministry in the parish where the relationships are multi-dimensional, where they are stuck with people all the time. They don't leave the hospital. In the parish, you're stuck with them. You have to stand them. They call you on the phone at night. How do you deal with people who are in a parish ministry where they are also public; where they shape a position, and you don't have the luxury of private opinions? I need you to come with me and decide how we can now, with all of our expertise for CPE and with the new understanding and valuation of theology and ecclesiology, shape what it means to be in generic ministry; and I cannot do that without you.

The second thing I need you for is that I need you to help me in a theological task of understanding what it means to call forth the laity to be carers. I need you, wherever you are working on that, to help me train my ministerial students not merely to have a vague sense of "we all love one another and our laity are now going to help." What do you actually do with the laity to help them stand other laity when they are so obnoxious and to help them stick by when you can't train them to be therapists? But what can we train them to be? I need you to do that.

The third thing I need you to do is to rapidly catch up theologically with what has happened in the last twenty years since you haven't read any theology. I need you to have seminars on Roman Catholic theology. There are basically very few good Protestant systematic theologians. We have David Tracy; we have Carl Rahner; we have Lonergan; we have Hans Kung. Most CPE and pastoral care people have not read any of these; and, yet, they are rapidly shaping ongoing methods and models of theologizing. You need to catch up with it so that you can step in, and you have a lot to say. I'll guarantee it. You need to do the same thing with liberation theology including feminism, and you primarily then, as you do that, need to claim that you are a theologian. In a sense, the whole discussion should focus around that. Your call is that you are a theologian. It isn't that you are a credentialed counselor or even a chaplain. You are called out of this magnificent experience where you are placed, and where you are foolish, and where you hurt; you are called to be able to lift up things that pastors and theologians can affirm and claim and be systematic about.

My favorite prayer, which I'll not say as a prayer, is a prayer which was on an invitation to a Jesuit ordination. The prayer states my understanding of ministry. It goes like this: We are simply asked to make gentle our bruised world, to tame its savageness, to be compassionate of all, including oneself; and, then, in the time left over, to repeat the ancient tale and go the way of God's foolish ones.

And I have heard Richard say "to repeat the ancient tale and go the way of God's foolish ones" is one which will sustain us, heal the bruises, and teaches us to be compassionate of all. I thank you for that.

Neuhaus Responds to Peggy Way

Amen.

NEUHAUS WRAP-UP

So very, very much has been said here by the respondents and by some of the comments during our break that I feel that at least some of what I said might have been of some help. I do most urgently want to underscore what the last respondent said. You have a potential contribution to the life of the church. If it is true, and I think it is, that pervasively in the church there has been a most debilitating loss of nerve about the particularity and the excitement and the worthwhileness and the intellectual nobility of the Christian proposition and of the community that is premised upon it, then the regaining will come from people like yourselves who have, in a very real way, unlike so many of the theologians, been out there and are out there. For you to come back and for you to say you know the most profound and classic of Christian theological reflections, both historically and at present, are magnificently true, are demonstrated true, that is a great contribution. The truths must be correlated in this way and with other things that we have learned, and indeed, precisely the kind of interaction that was called for here is required. Anything I have said is not a putdown of expertise in behavioral or psychological sciences--in no way.

There has to be, in your life as in the lives of any Christians who move outside of the realm of purely theological discourse, an experience of discovering that things ain't necessarily the way you were told according to the theological propositions, or at least that there are significant modifications that are called for. There is a magnificently necessary debunking dimension in which you become suspicious, robustly skeptical about things that in Christian piety or Christian doctrine seem self-evident. What is moral behavior and what isn't? What is altruistic behavior? Is it possible for there to be a deed of pure motive, and so forth and so on. And all of these things you begin to examine more carefully and more critically. It can lead to a kind of debunking which many people find depressing. They say, "My god, is the Christian proposition still true? When you take it apart in all of its pieces as formed by my particular experience, it doesn't seem to be as true as it seemed to be back in seminary" or whatever.

For many people it is also a liberating experience, and we still know that there is a need for lots of that. It was suggested here by the respondents that that was one phase that CPE went through--of liberation from what was viewed as the restrictions and the impositions of church teaching and career patterns and so forth.

Let us hope that that is a phase that we have gone through. I think that if we have gone through that phase of escaping from whatever the fundamentalisms were that seemed to us at one time oppressive, let us not be so insecure in our liberation from those fundamentalisms of Christian faith. Let us rather be so confident of the liberation that God has given us by His grace from those fundamentalisms that we can now intelligently and critically return to the fundamentals.

Thank you.

Question: Does Neuhaus feel there is a difference between the terms pastoral and psychotherapeutic since he seemed to use the word pastoral only at the beginning and the end of his presentation and used the other two interchangeably.

Answer: Well, I think through most of what I said I used the word ministry. I would hope that I was clear in saying what is meant by Christian ministry, which I would say is interchangeable with pastoral, but not with the conventional definition of the psychotherapeutic. In Christian ministry or in the pastoral office, one is leading a pilgrim person into the adventure toward the absolute, which is to say, toward God; whereas most of the practitioners of the psychotherapeutic, I would think, would not only consider that an illegitimate goal, but would be terrified by it as being, perhaps, even itself in need of therapeutic correction. So, in short, pastoral ministry and the psychotherapeutic are by no means interchangeable. It is precisely at the points where they differ in terms of the truth claims that they are making about human nature, particularly in the satisfactions available to human beings at this preliminary point in history, that it would seem to me the differences should be highlighted; and there needs to be a critical interaction to the benefit of both.

Question: What is salvation?

Answer: With reference to those specific cases you mention, I don't know what salvation would look like or does look like. I know that, if Jesus turns out to be right, that salvation is the entering more deeply into our sufferings only to discover that they are his and, unblinkingly, to find him. Jesus Christ is salvation. As to the way that is worked out, we are always cautioned to be very modest in saying much about our knowledge of it. There is no one Christian lifestyle. There are numerous Christian lifestyles as witnessed by the role of the saints from the S.O.B.'s to the sweetness and light types: bearing with it, being faithful, living on the premise of God's promise of his faithfulness. That is salvation. To have lived in such a way that one is not fearful of the Biblical truth that it is by the sufferance of the poor and of the weak that one enters the kingdom of God.

At the gates of the kingdom will stand, not St. Peter, contrary to popular mythology; he'll be very busy making speeches in the piazza or whatever, but at the gates of the kingdom stands Lazarus. In the marvelous requiem mass in the old form (which, unfortunately, has now been done away with, for which I am very sorry), the final censuring of the body after the requiem mass was: "and may choirs of angels receive you, and there where Lazarus is poor no more, may you be welcomed into the heavenly Jerusalem."

To have lived in such a way--it is to this that we call people, and to call them to this in the name of Jesus is salvation. Now, it is the present experience of salvation to have lived now in such a way that we are fully conscious of our personal responsibility as moral agents, and that we die with the prayer on our lips that our lives have been, all and all, more a welcoming than a resisting of the love which is the coming of the kingdom of God, and which has its terrifying criteria laid out in Matthew 25 in our relation to the least of these. It means insisting to people who say, "Yes, but tell me what is the answer to this now. What does it look like now in relation to this problem and that problem of mine and of people who are close to me?" that there is no answer; that the answer is the courage to live by grace in the absence of the answer. For the only answer, and we can settle for nothing less, is the coming of the kingdom of God. I don't know if that is helpful. It can be dismissed, I realize, as rhetoric; but, you see, rhetoric is simply, as was put so well, the telling of that tale. If that tale entails all truths, then we really never, any of us, go beyond the rhetoric of salvation. The Word is truth, and the words that emerge from the Word are inextricably connected with that truth; we have to have confidence in the statement of those words.

Question: Would you clarify why you say, "if Jesus is right?"

Answer: I realize that it is somewhat provocative to suggest that Jesus may be wrong, but I think it is quite necessary to say that. There is a sense, Cameron--and this, of course, would be a very big package indeed theologically to unpack; we can only touch on it here--in which, not that Jesus needs to be credentialled, but in which he needs to be vindicated. As distinct from the theology of liberation, I would say that what we really ought to be talking about is the theology of vindication. We can say with Saint Paul, and indeed with all faithful Christians, "I am persuaded that neither death nor life...et cetera...principalities and powers will not separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus, our Lord." I am persuaded, and I am persuaded of that.

I am persuaded in the sense that I entrust myself to that truth. That is a decision that I as a responsible person have made. That proof that is in the resurrection of Jesus, which signaled the kingdom of God and the final triumph of love over hatred, of peace over conflict, etc.; that truth has not yet been historically vindicated. It is intellectually conceivable that it may turn out to be wrong, that the whole of the Christian enterprise is a mistake, which is why we live by faith, which

is to say entrusting ourselves. We walk not by sight, but by faith. That doesn't mean that faith is simply a subjective or arbitrary thing by any means, as I Peter says, "Always be prepared to give a reason for the hope that is within you," and I think that the Christian position, and my position as a Christian in saying that I am persuaded, is, I hope, a very carefully reasoned position. I hope I can lay out the reasons why this is a persuasive definition of the way the universe is constructed; namely, that Jesus is right, and that in Him the absolute future has already appeared as you rightly say, "in our history," but it is still (and it seems to me, terribly urgent to underscore this) the very adventure of Christian existence to act upon that which will not be vindicated historically until "every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord." Christians are people who in that sense are people ahead of time; not ahead of time in terms of having a superior lifestyle or even a better understanding of many things and not necessarily of even being more moral or whatever, but they are ahead of time in their acknowledgement now of what will be acknowledged universally in the coming of the kingdom.

"ACPE Pilgrimage - Personal And Professional"¹

by John R. Thomas,
ACPE President-Elect
Mendota Mental Health Institute
Madison, WI 53704

I appreciate the high honor of succeeding J. Lennart Cedarleaf to the office of President of ACPE in January 1, 1980. While I do not have Len's wit, I have a portion of his warmth. To many of you who do not know us very well it may be interesting to note that Len's paths and mine actually started in the same midwestern city, Rockford, Illinois. Len was born in Rockford three years ahead of me and ever since then we have followed each other, including to California, which he in 1954 found to be the promised land! We didn't actually meet until the summer of 1943 when I was at St. Charles and Len was at Elgin. I was envious of him at that time, because Len was courting Aggie and he managed to talk Anton Boisen into letting him get out of the program early, in order to go ahead and get married. Len and Aggie, you've been in my heart ever since.

Personal

1942 was my vintage summer! After my first semester at McCormick Theological Seminary, I interviewed for CPE, was accepted only to learn later in February that the supervisor Don Beatty was going on active duty as an army chaplain. Two months later, after I had accepted an appointment to a church at Crivitz, Wisconsin for the summer, a gentleman came into Fowler Hall, using a cane, probably not this identical one that Len entrusted to me. He told me that the program at Elgin was open again and asked if I would still be interested. That man was Anton Boisen! Talk about "going into the by-ways and bringing people into the Kingdom" I felt singularly blessed by Anton for seeking me out!

I went to Elgin as "a liberal" looking down on Rheinhold Niebuhr's theology. I went to Elgin as a pacifist. Twelve weeks included daily attendance at psychiatric staff meetings, bringing patients out of insulin comas, and assisting those who had had electric shock treatments get some afternoon exercise, daily seminars with the Methodist supervisor and a Unitarian minister and Freudian graduate students in psychology and contact with Anton Boisen's case studies. It also included writing up my case study of a young college age patient, the son of a theological professor. I returned to seminary with many more questions than answers. I knew much less about religious experiences, including my own, than I had realized, I was more acquainted with the some-times constructive use of force in controlling

¹This is the complete text. The actual speech was condensed to fit the time schedule.

uncontrolled behavior and less of a pacifist. My understanding of human sin and evil was clarified, especially as to how difficult it was to help people develop more constructive behavior toward themselves as well as toward others.

I had the opportunity to read Carroll Wise's just published book, RELIGION IN ILLNESS AND HEALTH, Anton Boisen's THE EXPLORATION OF THE INNER WORLD, George Herbert Mead's MIND, SELF AND SOCIETY and Korzybski's SCIENCE AND SANITY. At the same time I began courting Marguerite, my late wife, all that same summer, no wonder I was in a whirl! The opportunity for reflection on my experiences and the conferences with the supervisor, where I very gingerly began to touch personal issues, were the beginnings of freedom for me. Not so much a freedom from religious strictures, fundamentalism and pietism, for these were not my background, but a freedom to become a somewhat less moralistic person than the one who had just recently entered seminary.

The second summer at the Illinois State Training School for Boys was a continuation of that growth, looking at my family relationships, sexual feelings and the Bible in a new light!

My ordination, graduation, marriage and active duty as a Naval reserve chaplain all took place the next year, 1944.

I went to active duty thinking that I knew a lot about pastoral counseling and, I should admit, feeling a bit superior to some of the fellows at chaplain school who had never even heard of CPE or counseling. There were few courses in counseling in the 1940's. However, my first assignment was with Marines at their Air Facility at Kinston, North Carolina, where I spent a year. After realizing that two units of CPE had not made me God's gift as a chaplain counseling US Marines, I came back to Chicago and Elgin for more CPE, personal analytic therapy, chaplaincy and supervisory experience. Once again Len's path and mine were intertwined. I followed him to Cook County Hospital and into therapy. I had been referred to the same analyst that Len was seeing! Our experiences were somewhat different as Len has reported elsewhere.

I went to seminary as a brain, but came out of CPE knowing that I had a feeling part of me that was also real.

As I reflect back on my first units of CPE I am grateful to those supervisors, fellow students, patients and clients for the changes and developments in my life. CPE was a most significant change experience in my life, and I coveted for others that experience. I would guess that the reason most of us are here today at this meeting is because of the gifts we have originally received from our CPE mentors and fellow students, and for the renewal of our sense of community and friendships with fellow supervisors and seminary representatives as well as for our professional needs. In the 1940's, we called ourselves the "fellowship of the sinners" though I'm certain that sometimes we had some of the smugness of saints towards those who were the "elect"! Brooks Holifield's April, 1979 article about ethical

differences in the roots of CPE resonates with my experience at this point!²

I will not go any further into my pilgrimage and how we are indebted to the past except to point out that we have never really fulfilled Anton Boisen's concern about the study of religious feelings, religious issues as the study of sin and salvation. Anton Boisen was very disappointed with the direction which CPE took in the late 40's and early 50's. By that time, Fred Kuether and others were concerned with "Standards" and with that word, about all words, "Certification." The Council for Clinical Training moved in that direction and later on as the groups merged, we continued our concern with Standards and Certification and, more recently, with Accreditation. We were concerned with helping seminary students and pastors to become more effective, to understand how one's personhood influenced the pastoral care and the pastoral care skills which they acquired. Anton Boisen's name is very familiar to us though I wonder how many of us have read his books and research articles? We genuflect at the phrase, "The Study of the Living Human Document." I suggest, however, that we have not yet really fulfilled Boisen's initial interest in studying the relationship between religious experiences and mental illness and mental health. Through CPE we have learned that what we want to communicate, however good our intentions are, depends pretty much on the quality of our relationship with the other person! It is not what we say about faith but how faithful we are in our presence with another. Our willingness to empathize and risk with the person who is going into the "valley of the shadow" or into the "abyss of meaninglessness" and loss of self, is what really tells the other person that we are people of faith.

Present

We believe in the incarnational reality of the New Testament - "The word became flesh and dwelt among us" and this is our model for ministry in a good sense of that word. As God's acceptance enables our self-acceptance, so that acceptance precedes our acceptance of others. We now know that our anger often both covers and reveals our fear and lack of faith. On the other hand, our involvement demonstrates our care. While we are not the only professional organization concerned about ministry, we have the most experience in standards, accreditation, certification and I would claim, as Peggy Way³ did this morning, that we have much to offer and we should be rightfully proud of where we have been and what we can offer. I believe we are uniquely able to assist seminary students in ministry formation and the clergy in continuing education as they integrate ministry skills and their personhood as a minister. I hope that we all continue to feel good about

²Holifield, E. Brooks. "Ethical Assumptions of Clinical Pastoral Education" in *Theology Today*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 1.

³In her response to Richard Neuhaus' paper, see "Proceedings of 1978-1979 Fall Conference.

that unique contribution which is CPE.

We can be rightly proud of what the ACPE and its predecessor organizations have accomplished for the ministry of the church.

Future - Immediate Concerns

We are continuing to act. We made significant decisions about budget and finances this year at the House of Delegates meeting. All of you, I guess, by this time, know that our House of Delegates has increased the dues of the supervisors from \$50.00 to \$100.00 for 1980 and authorized increases in other categories for 1981. That is an indication that we are willing to pay some price to keep our organization living and vital at all of its levels. I believe that we need to continue the good work of our organizational life. The last couple of years, the executive committee and the House, following its recommendations, have taken important and significant steps. One such action is to participate in the Council of Ministries in Specialized Settings which will hopefully pull together in a more meaningful way our various sister organizations along with the denominational representatives and I see great hope in that effort.

It is my hope that as we go to the next two years that we are going to be working much more closely with the AAPC. John Paton, I think that your comments today are well taken.⁴ We are ready in both groups, I think, to move more cooperatively. We have approved The Ad Hoc Committee on Women in CPE and that committee has already been appointed and is getting organized. I don't know how many years we'll need this committee but certainly we have given them the green light for this coming year to help us, as an organization and as individuals. While we, predominately male supervisors, may not be openly discriminating, we may be through our attitudes, subtly discriminating against women in CPE. That committee is to help us to raise our consciousness and to bring the experiences of the regions together for our mutual growth and development. We are all challenged. I would challenge that committee to set up workshops for our 1980 Regional and Fall Conferences so as to help us, who are male supervisors, identify possible ways in which we, without realizing it, have subtle sexist attitudes that do not contribute to the values we hold regarding good CPE, "person-centered" education!

The Executive Committee has authorized and the House has voted to finance a Caucus of Black Supervisors, April 15-16th, 1980, just before the Spring meeting of the ACPE Executive Committee in Washington, D.C. area, April 16-18. I hope that the black supervisors and pastors that are coming together under George Polk's call for that consultation and for the ensuing conversation with the Executive Committee will find some ways to make CPE more available, both at beginning levels and to supervisory levels for

⁴Remarks in his greetings to ACPE at this luncheon.

black students and supervisors.

Another concern and issue for me is the increasing emphasis on lay ministry in our various denominations including Roman Catholic. Should we confine our educational ministry to seminarians, religious and clergy? Do not we have something special to offer to the training of lay people in the ministry of the church? There are several supervisors that I can see here in this room who have already done innovative programs in equipping the laity for pastoral care. Perhaps special centers will need to be developed for this kind of training. Will we as clergy supervisors continue to be the best equipped people to conduct that training? I do not know but I think we ought to be open to that question.

What have we learned about the practice of ministry and organization of denominations which inhibits the development of the personhood of the person serving the local church? Can you and I creatively challenge our denominations as to what they are doing to clergy and how can we help to improve their personnel practices? We know from the counseling we've done with pastors that some are damaged by those processes. Can we share our experience with appropriate officials? Serve on committees?

Our relationships with theological seminaries, both faculty and students, need to be reviewed annually. When 85% of our CPE units are taken by students in the basic unit and over half of them are seminarians, can we not be more responsibly related to seminaries? Can we afford to continue to do less? Should not our accreditation review contain provision for some feed-back from local area seminaries? Should we develop a "hot-line" for seminary representatives and students who are concerned about placement, lack of supervisory reports, their lateness or complaints about particular centers?

Correctional ministry and the criminal justice system in our country has had, until recently, little input from the church and from those of us in CPE, notwithstanding the challenging chaplaincy ministry carried on by some of our supervisors.

Can we find imaginative and innovative ways to further our movement without being so completely dependent on the health care system of our country? I think that is a real challenge to us. I wish Richard Neuhaus,⁵ in his morning presentation, had dealt with the kind of ambiguity and tension with which most of us live, particularly those in governmentally-supported institutions. We look in one direction to our denominations and in sometimes opposite directions to our institutions as we justify our ministry. We need to do more about that. In one sense, we are, as it were, extremely dependent as educators on our chaplaincy positions within the health care industry. We have not yet found ways to challenge the thinking and giving of the churches and the seminaries to support its

⁵pps -See this issue of Proceedings of Fall Conference (or whatever is the correct title).

ministry and its education in these arenas of our institutions.

Should we not be asking ourselves as an organization, the question: What does it mean to have increasing numbers of unattached supervisors and inactive supervisors. Is this related to burn-out, to changing careers or to something else? What about the growth processes in the pilgrimages in CPE that you and I are in that creates changes in us - in our attitudes and behaviors which also impact on our families while we are in the training process. I second Len's tribute to the wives of CPE supervisors! Are we sometimes married to CPE and ACPE in ways that we are not to our spouses? We can easily point the finger at corporations for their total loyalty requirements and for the way that their executives give first allegiance to the corporation. Perhaps Nathan of old could be pointing the finger at us: "Thou art the man or woman!" - I hope that somewhere in our organizational life we can give more attention to that in the coming two years. Is this a researchable area?

We live in a continual tension between providing pastoral care to patients, clients and parishioners through the ministry of our students and justifying our position as clinical pastoral educators in a day when society is demanding the separation of educational costs from patient services. We are providing one of the most intensive educational experiences among any of the professions, and the most expensive, if it were not for the pastoral care provided by our students. Can we find imaginative and innovative ways to further our movement without being so dependent upon the health care system of our country? In our increasingly secular society, are we in the backwaters of the church's struggle for the soul of mankind or are we a part of the main stream, a part of the new "outreach?"

As an organization, we are living in the days of judicial reviews for just about everything and where rights of the individual are given such protection that the rights of the rest of can be severely limited by default. A difficult dilemma for all of us!

The field of medical ethics has not been directly influenced by our contributions-with few exceptions. Can we challenge ourselves to do more thinking and writing in this vital area? We are on the front lines of patients' decisions.

We took a leap of faith twelve years ago this month in Kansas City to merge our organizations into the ACPE.

Special Study and Future Directions

Two years ago, we found ourselves disquieted about the drift and direction of ACPE. The creation of the Special Study Committee was the response of the House of Delegates. It has worked hard to involve us in a study of our past, our present mission and values and in forecasts about our future.

We need to make significant decisions about our future program and budget and about our structure so that we keep receiving input from areas and regions about policies and standards decisions made by the House of Delegates and the Executive Committee. We are not going to have unanimous agreement about the solutions which we will finally adopt in 1980. I know we will continue to respect each other, even when our chosen way is not selected to be that of the majority.

Above all else, I hope we will be available for new and unusual definitions of the questions we are asking about our movement, our organization and about ourselves. As our answers are usually implicit and flow from the way we phrase the questions, I hope that we will review the major issues questions carefully before accepting them. Your task in discussion groups this afternoon will be to help review that process, the assumptions and the issues. The wording of our questions and issues will shape our future. The Spirit of God cannot be restricted to simplistic questions and answers. We will continue to truly serve as we ask searching questions about the training we are providing, our methodology, our organizational structure, our internal and external relationships and our value systems.

In the May 21, 1973 issue of MONDAY MORNING, a Presbyterian magazine for ministers, when the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. was involved in reorganization, the following quotation appeared. That denomination was involved in the throes of structural reorganization. We went from some 40 synods to 16 and changed many presbytery boundaries.

"We trained hard, but it seemed that every time we were beginning to form up into teams we would be reorganized. I was to learn later in life that we tend to meet any new situation by reorganization; and a wonderful method it can be for creating the illusion of progress while producing confusion, inefficiency and demoralization."

Gaius Petronius Arbiter said this about 60 A.D., not in 1950, 1960 or 1970!

This quotation also reminded me of when I was living in Austin, Texas. In talking with Leroy Kerney one day in Houston, I had noticed a lot of activity and a lot of changes in oil companies. Leroy Kerney said, "Well, whenever the oil companies are in a crisis, they do the opposite of what they have been doing and so if a group was centralized in Houston, they would de-centralize to Midland, Odessa and other places. If they were decentralized, they would centralize to Houston." The idea was to do something!

I am confident that the invitation we have this afternoon to respond to the Special Study Committee is not an activity done just for the sake of being busy. I certainly am confident that you will respond in the discussion session and help us to identify the issues. We have all, I think, been frustrated with the requirements of the accreditation review, the amount of paper that is produced by our local committees in the

institutions and forwarded on up the ladder, the laborious process we go through in changing our standards and the continuing amount of paper required for certification reviews and to keep our organizational committees and the House of Delegates active. Yet in the last twelve years, we have seen much good come out of all this work. We, as supervisors want the good results of organizational life and struggle but sometimes we do not want to pay for it in terms of dollars, energy and commitment. We are not alone - every voluntary organization that I know about goes through the same kind of struggle.

In our discussions this afternoon, and in our subsequent responses to the Special Study Committee and its recommendations to the House in 1980, we may well keep in mind Benjamin Franklin's observation: After sharing his bias against eating meat and fish, but being in a situation where he was hungry and only fish were available, he ate the fish, reporting: "So convenient it is to be a reasonable creature, since it enables one to find or make a reason for everything one has a mind to do."⁶ We need to respect our feelings, "what we have a mind to do" but we also need to evaluate them against what will be best for the CPE Movement and the future cause of ACPE. I think nearly all of us are basically interested in only enough organization to accomplish our mission.

I have few illusions about the de jure power of the office of President of ACPE. If I have them, I hope to be corrected. A recent article in the Washington Monthly about "POWER TO THE PEOPLE: Making the Constitution Work Again,"⁷ makes the point that we hold the President accountable even though he has no direct authority over any of the regulatory and other agencies and the bureaucracy keeps on going! In order to guard against the tyranny of the majority the Constitution provided for separate branches. In order to act quickly, in the first term of FDR, action and power was given to these agencies, and action was taken! In more recent years, they have become captives of narrow interests, and not capable of quick, responsive action!

"Today, faced with a political apparatus that seems unable to respond in any direction to our needs, we are in danger of losing our faith in democracy itself. We have taken to sniping at our democratic institutions, while we have grown disturbingly comfortable under our judicial commissars."⁸

I trust that we are aware of how our own feelings of discouragement about the directions of government, the grave international issues of Nuclear warfare, nuclear power, energy needs, conservation needs, Third World nations' struggles for a larger percentage of this world's goods - probably as we share a smaller percentage of available energy, goods and services - also affect our personal and organizational relationships.

⁶Autobiography

⁷Kaus, Robert, pps. 51-58, October 1979

⁸op. cit.

We do not minister and educate in a social vacuum! We need a theology of hope today, a theology of the resurrection (for those of us who are Christian) to reach toward the uncertain future.

My Commitment

I come to the office of president as one who believes that modern society requires that for us to be effective, we need both strong regional and national organizations. Because we have basically had an effective organization these past twelve (12) years, we have made significant progress in standards, accreditation and certification. I have seen the value of a significant question, carefully posed, and directed organizationally in the "right" channels result in a new service program. Through a skillful mobilization of people resources and funds, vital programs have been developed and new directions have been given to ministry. I have participated in such developments in other organizations. I hope to continue to do this through ACPE! I am dedicated to continuing the purposes of ACPE through its House of Delegates, the executive committee and regional organizations. I intend to use whatever skills and abilities I possess to facilitate the continuing development and evolution of the ACPE organization. When the Special Study Committee recommendations are made next year, I hope to be a part of that process and to chair as fairly as I know the House debate and actions in November 1980, and to provide what leadership I can to the implementation of those as yet unknown decisions. I sense today a warmer, more "together" feeling among supervisors, seminary representatives and denominational representatives.

I have been impressed by the warmth and openness of President Len Cedarleaf and the other ACPE officers and the members of the Special Study Committee. I want to continue that policy of openness and accessibility! I am glad that there has been active campaigning for the office of the president, even though it is doubtful that I would be here today if that were the pattern two years ago! Can we find a way to involve more of our membership in the selection of our elected officers?

"To be employed is to be happy" -- "Very few others are as busy as he" are quotes from my 1936 high school and 1942 college annuals, respectively. I apparently have not changed very much during the intervening years though I trust my reasons for being busy, and also for being still, are different than they were back then. I pledge to you to be an active president, utilizing my energy and experience and skills for the whole ACPE.

I expect to follow Len's example of taking an early retirement. I planned last year to consider it this coming September. Despite inflation I'd still like to and I appreciate your good example, Len, and I hope to follow you soon!

I want to give you a visible presidency and to be as available to local centers, regions and House committees as my time and ACPE funds permit. I hope to complement and supplement ACPE leadership in these next

two years. I appreciate, as does Len, the very capable support and staff leadership provided by Chuck Hall, with his firm grasp of both issues and details. We have been blessed. Despite or because of the differences and difficulties throughout the years, I admire and appreciate you, Chuck, for what you have helped us do as the ACPE.

Our New Leadership Team

I would like at this time to introduce those of our new leadership group who have been elected at this meeting. Al Anderson, our president-elect, you recognized earlier as he blessed our meal. You have not had a chance yet to recognize Helen Terkleson, the new vice-president of ACPE. Helen has lost her voice but I'll ask her to stand so everyone can see and recognize her. We'll give you a chance to say something next year, Helen. I present to you some new members of the Executive Committee, Milton Snyder, Accreditation Chairperson; Clark Aist, Standards Chairperson; and Bill Kraft, our new Finance Chairperson and Dave Farley, our new assistant Treasurer. We appreciate the continuing activities of our present officers who remain in office and our continuing committee chairpersons.

Before I conclude and in a couple of minutes turn it over to Jim Gebhart for some remarks from the Special Study Committee, Len, I would like you to stand. Here is a simple token of my personal esteem for you in the office of president. This gift will both be a symbol of your success and a reminder of Presbyterian humility, may you wear this T-shirt on the fairways of California - "Prexy 1978-1979, ACPE" but see the back side, your continuing failures as challenges: "par and a royal flush." Len, here is also a picture, a reminder to you of your pastoral care activities in the "after-hours" of many a conference. May you continue to have sick friends to visit so as to maintain one of your unique ways of providing pastoral support. It's a picture of poker players! And I would like to invite all of you who have been pastored to in any way by Len to come up and put your autograph on the rear of this, immediately after. Thank you, Len! I am glad you will continue on the executive committee and the House for the next two years. You now follow me into the role of regional director! The Pacific Region is fortunate, indeed!

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.